DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 423 689 FL 025 492

AUTHOR	Casanave, Christine Pearson, Ed.; Simons, J. David, Ed.
TITLE	Pedagogical Perspectives on Using Films in Foreign Language Classes. SFC Monograph #4.
INSTITUTION	Keio Univ., Fujisawa (Japan). Inst. of Languages and Communication.
ISSN	ISSN-0918-1199
PUB DATE	1995-05-00
NOTE	97p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Classroom Techniques; College Instruction; *Copyrights; Critical Thinking; *Cultural Education; Film Study; *Films; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Instructional Materials; Journal Writing; *Listening Skills; Second Language Instruction; *Second Languages; Sex Role; Skill Development; Sociocultural Patterns; Student Journals; *Student Projects; Thinking Skills; Videotape Recordings
IDENTIFIERS	*Japan

ABSTRACT

This collection of articles on use of films in second language instruction, particularly for teaching English as a second language (ESL) in Japanese colleges and universities, includes: "Whole Movies and Engaged Response in the Japanese University ESL Classroom" (David P. Shea); "Films in English Class: Going Beyond a Content Approach" (Jeffrey Cady); "Learning by Collaboration and Teaching: A Film Presentation Project" (Christine Pearson Casanave, David Freedman); "Finding the Last Puzzle Piece Through Conversion" (Yoko Shimizu); "The Value of Reading and Film Viewing in Fostering Critical Thinking" (Sae Yamada); "The Listening-Viewing Diary in an Advanced Listening/Speaking Class" (Naomi Fujishima); "The Portrayal of Women in American Films: A Scenario for Misunderstanding" (Yoshiko Takahashi); "An Anthropological Perspective on Films in the Language Class" (Thomas Hardy); and "Copyright Law and Video in the Classroom" (J. David Simons). (Individual papers contain references). (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

FL

ISSN 0918-1199

ED 423 689

PEDAGOGICAL PERSPECTIVES ON USING FILMS IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSES

Christine Pearson Casanave and J. David Simons, Editors

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Yoshiko Takahashi
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

FL025492

慶應義塾大学湘南藤沢キャンパス
言語コミュニケーション研究所

SFC ロゴス叢書　4

PEDAGOGICAL PERSPECTIVES ON USING FILMS IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSES

Christine Pearson Casanave and J. David Simons, Editors

Sae Yamada, Assitant Editor

CONTRIBUTORS

Jeffrey Cady
Christine Pearson Casanave
David Freedman
Naomi K. Fujishima
Thomas Hardy
David P. Shea
Yoko Shimizu
J. David Simons
Yoshiko Takahashi
Sae Yamada

March 1995

(see also Journal Writing: Pedagogical Perspectives,
C. P. Casanave, Ed., Keio University SFC Monograph #3)

慶應義塾大学湘南藤沢キャンパス
言語コミュニケーション研究所

Table of Contents

Introduction.....ii

Whole Movies and Engaged Response in the Japanese University ESL Classroom.....1
David P. Shea

Films in English Class: Going Beyond a Content Approach.....18
Jeffrey Cady

Learning by Collaboration and Teaching: A Film Presentation Project.....28
Christine Pearson Casanave and David Freedman

Finding the Last Puzzle Piece Through Conversion.....40
Yoko Shimizu

The Value of Reading and Film Viewing in Fostering Critical Thinking.....45
Sae Yamada

The Listening-Viewing Diary in an Advanced Listening/Speaking Class.....52
Naomi K. Fujishima

The Portrayal of Women in American Films: A Scenario for Misunderstanding.....63
Yoshiko Takahashi

An Anthropological Perspective on Films in the Language Class.....71
Thomas Hardy

Copyright Law and Video in the Classroom.....78
J. David Simons

Author Biostatements.....91

INTRODUCTION

Christine Pearson Casanave and J. David Simons

In preparing this monograph, eight teachers and two students came together in an extraordinarily rewarding collaborative undertaking to produce a collection of papers on various aspects of how and why we use films in classes of English as a foreign language. When we began this project, we knew only that many of us used films in language teaching and learning, and that as a theme for our mongraph, the topic of films would thus allow a maximum number of people to contribute essays to the volume. However, we did not expect the rich variety of perspectives, approaches, and writing styles that now characterize the finished publication. As a result of this variety, the monograph has surpassed our expectations in terms of interest, quality, and value to readers. It is a collection that has something for everyone--for those who use films primarily as cultural content and those who use them as linguistic resources; for those who want to know how films can be used in classes to those who want to know how students respond to films as they are used in those classes.

Some of the papers address common or complementary issues. We have grouped these papers together so that they may be read in sequence, if readers so desire. The first two papers, for example, deal with two different views on the question of how films can be used in the language class. David Shea argues persuasively that films are best used holistically, as content for critical thinking. Not fully convinced by the point of view presented in Shea's paper, Jeff Cady struggles with the issue of whether to use films primarily as content or as resources for focused language instruction. Christine Casanave and David Freedman then describe a film presentation project for their intermediate English students in which films were used holistically to help students learn to view films critically and to present their views to a real audience. While the authors remain committed to a holistic use of films, they also recognize the need to provide students with sufficient language support to complete the tasks that teachers assign.

The next two papers look at the holistic use of film in the language class from the student's perspective. The positions taken in the two student essays represent two (of potentially many) different responses, and remind readers that students do not respond in uniform ways to films as the primary source of content. Yoko Shimizu did have a positive experience, describing a "conversion" experience that changed her from a person who viewed films solely as entertainment to one who now views films as texts to be

engaged with at deeper analytical and personal levels. Sae Yamada, on the other hand, found that the way films were used in her English class could not engage her mind in critical and imaginative thinking to the same extent that reading does. In a less holistic, more narrowly focused approach to film in the English class, practicing teacher, Naomi Fujishima describes how she experimented with a "listening-viewing diary." In this technique, students make notes and presentations on specific short scenes from full-length films. The author found both benefits and drawbacks to this technique for helping students increase their knowledge of both linguistic and cultural aspects of the films.

In the next two essays, the authors discuss the ways that films do or do not lend themselves to helping students increase their understanding of their own and others' cultures. Yoshiko Takahashi analyzes the portrayals of women in several American films, arguing that the messages in these films can easily be misinterpreted by Japanese students, who evaluate the feminist issues in the films according to their own cultural expectations. She cautions teachers to contextualize these films within a background of information about Western culture. Thomas Hardy, on the other hand, finds that American and Japanese films can productively be used to help students recognize the stereotypes they hold about Americans, and to then reflect their new understanding back on themselves. The result is not just that students learn something about American culture, but that, more importantly, they come to know their own culture in more perceptive and critical ways.

The monograph ends with a very practical look at the complex and little-understood issue of copyright law regarding the use of film and video in the classroom. In a discussion of the copyright laws in both Japan and the United States, David Simons takes readers through a number of scenarios that classroom language teachers might face as they prepare lessons using films and videos, noting the legal and ethical dilemmas that arise.

This collection of essays in no way presumes to offer a complete picture of issues concerning the place of films in foreign language teaching and learning. It does, however, represent a variety of contrasting viewpoints that we hope will make readers consider these and other issues in the context of their own teaching. The process of writing and then reviewing each other's essays has done that for the authors who have contributed to this monograph, and helped us appreciate the value of diversity in our approaches to language teaching.

WHOLE MOVIES AND ENGAGED RESPONSE IN THE JAPANESE UNIVERSITY ESL CLASSROOM

David P. Shea[1]

One of the definitive moments of clarity I've experienced as a teacher of English occurred a couple of years ago when getting on an elevator. I'd just finished class and was returning to my office with an arm full of papers and the video I was showing at the time, *Chariots of Fire*. As I stepped onto the lift, I ran into a fellow teacher, a British chap whom I'll call Nigel for the sake of argument.[2] Nigel was holding in his hands a copy of the video *Tootsie*. "Oh, so you're using movies too?" I asked, thinking to pick up a few tips about using film in the ESL classroom. "Oh yes," he said, "but only for five minutes."

"Five minutes?"

"Of course," he replied confidently. "ESL teachers too often misuse videos. They simply turn on the television set and sit back to enjoy the movie. Students don't understand the words and fail to grasp what's being said. They just watch the gestures and scenery in the background and try to figure out what's going on without the vocabulary or grammar or any linguistic features whatsoever. It goes in one eye and comes out the other and doesn't even reach the ears!" Nigel chortled.

I was mortified. Nigel's description of irresponsible ESL methodology pretty well summed up the way I had just run my class. Always susceptible to self-doubt, I thought I'd better find out more about Nigel's view of language pedagogy, so I followed him out of the elevator and into the teachers' room.

"I show a five minute segment of a video," he explained. "Then we review critical vocabulary and expressions. Students answer comprehension questions about what happened, or complete an information-gap exercise where half the class knows something the other half doesn't. We talk about linguistic features such as register in the dialogue, and students perform role plays where they work on features of intonation. Sometimes they complete exercises utilizing relevant linguistic structures. After we fully analyze the language used in one five minute segment, we watch the next selection, working our way selectively through the movie."

---

[1]This paper is a substantially revised version of a presentation made at the SFC Symposium on Videos in the EFL Classroom, Keio University SFC, January, 1993. I am grateful to Yoshiko Takahashi for the original invitation to participate in the conference, and to Chris Casanave and J. David Simons for their many helpful suggestions and criticisms during the revision process.

[2]Originally Nigel was a real person, but I have changed his name and put words in his mouth. He did, however, express reservations about the misuse of videos as we rode the lift.

There it was: a rigorous, linguistically oriented approach to learning English through movies. What more could I say? My confidence shaken, I went home to think about my approach to teaching. I also went to class the next day and asked my students what *they* thought about my approach to teaching and, after a good deal of reflection, some more questioning and a little research, I'm willing not only to admit I have continued using "whole" full-length movies in my classroom over the past two years, but also to argue that it's a reasonably good idea. It even serves, in some contexts, to facilitate successful language acquisition, but of course that depends on what you mean by language acquisition and why students go about the endeavor in the first place.

The Social Fabric of Language Education

In my own second language training, I come from grammatical stock. I was raised a FALCON in the Cornell intensive program in Japanese,[3] where ten hours of drill, language lab, and study a day take students from zero to linguistic sixty in twelve harrowing months. It's the only way to go, especially if you've got other things to do and don't really mind teetering on the brink of exhaustion. The FALCON program is the brainchild of Professor Eleanor Jorden, who has very clear ideas about using videos in the language classroom. Jorden (1991), for example, believes that videos should be (among other things) linguistically sound (i.e., structurally driven), ordered (i.e., based on frequency), and "clean" (i.e., building on what has already been mastered), rather than humorous skits where the focus is on a story instead of language. Full length movies are out of the question. They aren't structurally driven, they're certainly not clean, and there's no apparent linguistic order to the dialogue.

But FALCON is for high-flying language birds, intent on where they're going and willing to sacrifice much of themselves (including most of their time) to get there. There is also a "washout valve" (Schumann, 1978) which allows slow-moving slaggards who, for one reason or other, don't work to be "flushed," so to speak, out of the program. Moreover, most of Jorden's (1991) comments are focused on start-from-the-beginning students, not the "false beginners" at Japanese universities who not only have already extensively studied structural aspects of the language, but also routinely expect to pass English whether they come to class and do any of the assignments or not. Not to mention other overwhelming constraints on actually studying English at the university: two hour a day commutes to campus on crowded trains, eight to ten classes per semester, thirty five to forty students per class, and so on.

---

[3]Called FALCON for Far East Asian Language Concentration, presently directed by Robert Sukle.

Nigel reminds me somewhat of a baby FALCON, or perhaps a robin dressed in falcon feathers. That is to say, on one hand Nigel wants to focus on language, its structure and form, in the interests of successful and effective acquisition. On the other hand, Nigel seems to be rigorously unprincipled about the linguistic aspects of the movies he introduces, and he's willing to use entertainment as a teaching tool. Jorden argues that serious language pedagogy and entertainment don't mix, which seems especially true for learners at initial stages. Nigel appears to be sitting on a theoretical fence, as robins are wont to do, between movie aficionados in their ground-floor seats and falcons circling high in the rarefied linguistic air above.

Although I too feel that a clean, structurally driven approach is probably the most efficient and linguistically sound way to use videos in the ESL language classroom, I don't feel that it's necessarily the most appropriate pedagogy in every context of study. There are obviously other contexts imaginable, such as my freshmen and sophomore Japanese university students who have already studied a good deal of English grammar in rather artificial, test-driven situations, and who have some very definite, though not always congenial ideas about what English is and where they stand in personal relation to it. A grammar-centric approach is inherently based on small classes of highly motivated, begin-at-the-beginning students with a lot of time on their hands to do things like devote much of it to study.

The issue is not simply that the structure of the curriculum in Japanese universities doesn't allow for rigorous, efficient, intensive language practice. The issue primarily concerns the six to seven year odyssey Japanese students typically make through the hellishly intricate grammatical maze that's called English education in this country. Some have gone so far as to compare the effort to battling the monster Godzilla (McCornick, 1992). By the time they enter the university, most Japanese students have already memorized, if not learned, a good deal of English grammar and vocabulary, even though in most cases they can't articulate that fact themselves. We must be careful, then, about assuming that language acquisition takes place in a sterile vacuum which involves linguistic ability measured on a test, unaffected by extraneous variables such as the social fabric in which English is woven. It is critical to recognize that language study is not simply about the linguistic facts of English, especially when much of language is not about linguistics anyway, but about culturally situated thoughts, ideas, and feelings which are related to things that might be best defined as the social world. From the student point of view, however, English has few moorings in the social nature of communication. Language study is more often anchored in a berth of alienating frustration.

Input, Interest, and Responsive Engagement

A case can be made (though neither Nigel nor Professor Jorden would likely make it) that popular films provide extensive exposure to new linguistic expressions that can be acquired in the process of trying to understand communicative messages. Krashen (1982), for one, makes this kind of argument. He might describe movies in terms of providing "mass quantities" of interesting input which, if more or less comprehensible to students, can be acquired in the course of trying to understand what's going on and what's being said. Watching movies, students are exposed to new idioms and vocabulary items, different accents and rhythms, as well pragmatic routines (both formulaic and otherwise) of doing things with words. But even if this natural account of language acquisition is true, it is only half the story (if that much) of what I'm trying to accomplish in English class by using films.

Actually, I use popular movies as much to *stimulate interest* in English as to provide input of pragmatic and linguistic features of the language to be learned. Movies are narratives that, like literature (and even, in fact, conversation), tell a story about the world, presenting imaginative slices of reality, mini-worlds in which viewers are invited to enter and take part. In the case of *popular* movies,[4] the dynamics of the narrative are intriguing and compelling to many people, not just English teachers who are *paid* to be compelled about language and indeed go so far as to spend their spare time thinking about it. The popular movie is a proven hit, an intrinsic motivator guaranteed to capture the attention spans of even large groups of ordinary people, and it is this arresting act of arousal which can draw jaded university students into the "world" of English as a second language, thus transforming it from an alien, dusty academic subject into a matter of personal significance worthy of attention, engagement, and sometimes even excitement. In other words, the emotional wallop of film serves to stimulate responsive engagement, which is at the heart of authentic communication, even though it's characteristically absent in the traditional English classroom.

I don't completely reject the notion of attention to form as a component of language acquisition (e.g., van Lier, 1989; Schmidt, 1994). I admit that I do ask students to approach the story as *language students*, to watch the movie, for example, with their hands as well as their brains, taking notes on word use, recording unfamiliar vocabulary and expressions, in addition to noticing various aspects of the literary structure of the

---

[4] I would distinguish between popular movies and vapid movies without substance. That is, I would admit that some movies, though popular would not be appropriate for an ESL class. While beauty is admittedly in the eye of the beholder, I exclude gratuitous violence and pornography from use in class.

narrative.[5] And as an orientational prop before the movie begins, I often present general background information that includes such relevant details as the names of central characters, the time frame and location where the action takes place, and a broad overview of major themes. I also ask leading questions. For example, I might say, "Do you like rock music? You know the Beatles, of course. But did you know that the Beatles were influenced by Black music from America?" in order to introduce the concept of "Soul" in *The Commitments*, which is a story about Irish working-class lads who play the music of African Americans because they consider themselves the "Niggers of Europe."

However, my central focus is not a unidirectional concern with stimulating interest, whether it's in the service of comprehending the general meaning of a communicative message or noticing the grammatical structure of linguistic form. In either case, such an approach captures only part of what it means to develop fluency (or "literacy") in English the second language. To stop there would be, in effect, to adopt the transmission model of pedagogy Freire (1970) has called "banking" education. Students aren't empty receptacles into which teachers rich in knowledge transfer facts and information, making linguistic deposits into mental bank accounts. Even though the transmission model of education is widely accepted, perhaps even expected, in Japan, it's important to avoid the recipient way students are positioned in discussions of language "acquisition" as consumers of language merchandise, as if they were accumulating fashionable vocabulary apparel and grammatical accessories.

In addition to engagement as stimulated interest in English, I want to emphasize the active, dynamically productive character of response when language is approached as a form of social activity in the world. In other words, language "acquisition" is located in active, creative response to what other people say (both in conversation and in film), and that's where it derives its energy (and "success," too). Through articulating what they think and expressing their feelings and opinions, students "acquire" language by making it their own and using it to understand what's going around around them.

It's not easy to make sense of the world, and not just because inscrutable government bureaucrats and crooked politicians devise arcane rules and obstruct citizens' rights. Sense making is an inherently dynamic and creative activity that requires the expressive articulation of ideas and opinions. Even to understand the phrase, "Mary had a little lamb," for example, requires an active, engaged construction of ideas. Unless the context is defined, it's impossible to say what the words mean, whether Mary cared for a sheep,

---

[5]There's no need to restrict language acquisition to word-level skills and knowledge of grammatical structure. Interpreting a cultural text, whether an artistic production or daily conversation, also requires an understanding of such "literary" elements as theme, symbolization, imagery, which are critical to grasp the full nuance of what is being conveyed.

ate a meat dish, or gave birth to a meek child.[6] And such semantic shenanigans only hint at the dynamic complexity of the response required to "understand" what the word "Stop" might mean in the first scene of the movie *Boyz N the Hood* when Tre Stiles and his elementary school classmates walk past the one-way street sign. No text, whether a short phrase or a whole movie, means anything apart from our active engagement in articulating what it means, which is point of Bakhtin's notion of heteroglossia and the multivocality of all utterances (Voloshinov, 1973). The interaction between the audience (in this case, students) and the text (in this case, movies) serves to tells us what the movie "says" and what it "means." Without this interaction, without the dynamic engagement of the learner producing his or her own interpretation of the text, there is no communication. Arguably, there is no language learning either.

Strong arguments have been made for the value of production in second language acquisition. In Swain's (1986) formulation of "comprehensible output," distinguished from Krashen's (1982) more passive notion of comprehensible input, second language students are thought to need a "push" beyond a loose, general "understanding" of the gist of communicative messages. Without the nudge to explicitly articulate thoughts, feelings, and opinions, Swain tells us, students can fail to notice the linguistic means of expression, such as the syntactic structure, which in turn works to improve accuracy and thus (the argument goes) develop fluency:

> [P]roducing in the target language may be the trigger that forces the learner to pay attention to the means of expression needed in order to successfully convey his or her own intended meaning. (Swain, 1986, p.249)

While I find that, in some respects (i.e., the respects about productive expression being central to developing second language fluency) I agree with this formulation, I think there is a need to more fully recognize the social role of communicative activity in production. I have particular doubts about the phrase "intended meaning," which sounds very rational and fixed. Since language doesn't exist for the transmission of chunks of information between individual speakers, any message's meaning is situated within a social relationship, where meaning is fluidly and creatively shaped according to the dynamic quality of the audience's engagement. How a listener orients to a speaker changes not only the meaning of what is said but also, in a sense, the kind of person saying it. Although this joint, cooperative character of language use is often overlooked by individualistic capitalists who have no interest whatsoever in sharing anything with other people, the heteroglossic, collaborative character of communication reminds us that

---

[6]The example is adapted from Edelsky (1992, pp.99-100).

the acquisition of ESL "fluency" (or ability) cannot be divorced from the contexts of interaction because language itself is generated there. That is why comprehending what a movie (or a novel or a person) is saying involves far more than the composite of vocabulary words and correct grammatical structure. That is also why resolutely focusing on these components of language, rather than the movie, can be such a deadening, incomprehensible endeavor for so many students trapped in university ESL classrooms.

Classroom Practice

The concrete response to Nigel remains: "How *do* I use whole movies in English class?"

Typically, when I show a film, I stop midway (partly because movies are ordinarily 120 minutes or longer in length and classes are only 100. The movie simply won't fit in one class). Then I ask students to make an entry in their notebooks, writing their response to what they've seen or thought about as they watched the movie. In some classes, I adopt an open-ended approach, asking students to write whatever response comes to mind. I say, "Anything is fine: whatever you think, whatever you feel." Sometimes, though, especially when students appear unsure and reluctant to respond, I use a list of questions adapted from a handout by Robert Probst (see Appendix 1) to stimulate thinking and elicit response.

In either case, my primary concern is with the content of a message, with what the students have to say, and I emphasize fluency far more than accuracy, if I mention accuracy at all. In large part, the purpose of response at this stage, both spoken and written, is to break the ice and stimulate thinking, allowing students to explore relevant issues freely, without concern for spelling or grammar or other standards of conventional style. The primary goal is to invigorate student brains, which too often seem frozen in permafrost, incapable of generating ideas much longer than single sentences.[7] Stiff, naked opinions need to be warmed up and clothed in persuasive explanations of example, argument, and illustration, which I often try to initiate by asking, "What do you mean?" or "Why do you think so?" I use other comments, appreciation ("That's a good idea!"), extension ("From a related point of view...") and even challenging critique ("What about this aspect, how would it fit in?") with much the same purpose.

---

[7]I hold to the opinion that this reluctance is due more to experience in high-pressure test-driven high school English classes engendering passivity, than to any cognitive inability or lack of linguistic skill.

A major pedagogic battle, then, is ideological, waged in the contest over the definition of the activity and to what purpose students talk in English and put pens to ESL paper. I want students to recognize that they're communicating to someone about something; at the same time, I want them to recognize that, in relation to their classmates, they *are* that someone and that something is important and worthy of attention, not simply a matter of required performance for the teacher's evaluation based on notions of formal accuracy or prescriptive style.

Since by training, many Japanese students of English feel more comfortable writing their thoughts and opinions than articulating them orally, the journal entry is also a chance to crystallize ideas, giving students a self-constructed scaffold which will later support oral discussion and contributions to small group as well as large class interaction.

After the preliminary journal entry, I ask students to divide into small groups of four or five, where they take turns expressing their impressions and opinions, talking about aspects of the movie they find interesting, or perhaps about aspects of their own experience they find relevant. Depending on the class and individual personalities, this group work often generates an excited babble of talk, and the talk is primarily in English, even in "lower level" classes (though I do have to remind people once in a while not to lapse into Japanese). After everyone has had a turn to talk, I generally ask one or two members of each group (or as many people as time and attentions spans permit) to stand at their desks and make an oral summary, either of their own contribution or their group's discussion, to the class. My job is to reply to that response, and it is an important job.

I try not to correct linguistic errors, even when I hear them, but to respond to the substance of the ideas, focusing on content in a way consistent with techniques used by teachers who employ journals as communicative tools in the ESL classroom (e.g., Casanave, 1993). First, I try to encourage and support student production while resisting the urge to take control of the talk or ask "known-answer" questions which only lead students to confirm what I already may know and want to hear. Second, I respond to what students say using interactive discourse strategies of engaged response: summary, clarification, restatement, extension, and so on. By doing things like noticing ideas, asking for more explanation, extending important implications, and pressing for clarification, I am engaging with students as an authentic partner in a joint, scaffolded construction of talk (see Cazden, 1989; Palincsar, 1986; Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976 for discussions of scaffolding). I am also demonstrating a wide range of discourse practices, from vocabulary words and grammatical structures to interactional patterns and pragmatic routines, as well as interpretive approaches to texts, which students, through their own engagement in the interaction, can appropriate as their own (Donato, 1994). Through this scaffolded interaction, students can also develop a sense of the discourse community in

which they are a part, and the voices of their classmates with whom they are talking.

Then I ask students to go home (or to the computer lab) and write their ideas in a two page (500 word) journal, or informal essay, by which I mean that I want students to speak from their own experience in everyday, conversational language, writing as if they were talking to a friend and trying to explain what they're thinking. Although some students spend a considerable amount of time and effort on these journals, with multiple revisions and careful computer spell-checks, other students seem to dash them off in one unmodified, last minute sitting the night before it's due. Regardless, I guarantee all essays an "A" if they are long enough, 100% the student's own words, and submitted on time. Interestingly, and rather paradoxically, I found that not only the stylistic flair but also the accuracy of the writing actually improved from one semester to the next when I instituted this guaranteed grade policy. In spite of my nearly total lack of attention to features of correctness (apart from insisting that everyone run a spell check program and put two spaces after a period), the writing is often clean, sharp, and vivid, with a resonant authorial voice and sometimes surprising insights.

In the next class, students exchange their essays with up to three or four people. They read each other's writing and then write their own response in the margins or the bottom of the page.

At this point, I collect the papers and take them home to read. As I proceed through the essays, I also respond in the margins, sometimes asking for clarification, sometimes expressing surprise or agreement, sometimes posing questions, sometimes making a related comment on the topic being discussed. At the bottom of the page, I add a slightly more extended reply. In my written responses, I try to follow the same principle of scaffolding engagement that I use to respond to student talk in class, with a primary focus on the content of ideas.

Then I give the papers back. Until now, that was the end of it, more or less, though it shouldn't be. First, in order to be more effective (and more naturally engaged), I think I need to deepen the texture of the interaction by letting students respond again to my comments. That is, I will hand the essays back to students and ask them to respond in turn to my comments as they revise what they've written for more clarity, persuasiveness, thoroughness, and so on. In this way, the focus on critical ideas, jointly negotiated among the students and the teacher, will drive the further development of communicative skills. Second, I'm sure that this kind of exchange needs to be more vigorously integrated into a student publication program. As Yoko Shimizu reports in this volume, her class produced a collection of response essays on film, which we distributed to class members and the school library. This kind of publication, which makes the connection between the classroom writer and the real world reading audience

even clearer, should be a regular, institutionally sustained feature of every English class.

Student Voices

Another question remains. How much English do students learn engaging in this kind of classroom activity, focused on an engaged response to whole movies? Would they learn more from Nigel perhaps?

I have to admit that I'm not sure and, though it may sound rather irresponsible, I'm not sure I want to find out either. Students would have to be tested and, aside from not wanting to spend already limited class time on non-productive evaluation, tests are not accurate measures of the kind of learning (or, rather, activity) I'm talking about. The joint scaffolding of conversational and journal interaction is not measured on most testing instruments. Fluency of expression and a focus on ideas and feelings is not usually recognized either. In fact, tests are a big part of the original problem, because communication is inherently fluid and the degree of its success depends largely on what the participants bring to it and in turn expect to receive. Alternative testing measures are called for, ones which include such factors as attitudes toward language use, confidence in expressing ideas and experiences, fluency and the persuasiveness of ideas, quality of engagement and participation, and so on. These aspects of language use are not easy to measure.

It also depends on what we mean by "English," too. When language is defined as a kind of social practice carried out in contexts of use, the context of sitting at a table making grammaticality judgments fails to help the student much and usually bolsters only the self-esteem of the test-giving scientist. Taking tests is generally alienating for everyone but students who get good marks anyway, which brings us full circle back to the examination grind (some call a battle with Godzilla) leading up to entering the university in the first place.[8]

What I do know, though, is what students say, and for the purposes of this paper, I've collected a few excerpts from recent class journals.[9] These selections come from a "low-level" class full of young men who were generally good at sports but quite sceptical about English (for good reason in many cases, given their spartan training in the formal

---

[8]For an insightful critique of the perils of testing and biased conceptions of reading and writing, particularly the tendency to trivialize "context-specific activity" and standardize interpretation, see Edelsky (1992, pp.141-153).

[9]I have edited the excerpts slightly, correcting spelling and typographical features for ease of reading.

intricacies of English leading up to the university entrance exam). For present purposes, I will call them class B (for basement). The excerpts included here, however, demonstrate an engagement in the communicative use of English, both in terms of interested excitement, as well as the active production of personally relevant interpretations of meaning and action in the world. Though a wide range of opinions are evident, the comments nevertheless suggest (to me, at least) that a Nigelian focus on English rather than movies, might well only serve to increase the scepticism toward second language study, which arguably played a roll in originally having the students assigned to a low level class.

The students are responding to the movie *Field of Dreams*:

> This story made me think about "What is my dream?" and more things "What am I doing?" and "Do I really find what my heart really want to do." Concerning about my recently life, I noticed that I did not have any serious things to do. - *Hitoshi*

> I don't usually like watching movies, because I am bored ... to sleep at last. So I have been to watching movies only 3-4 times. Of course, I don't like watching rental video. But I like watching movies at English classes very much. Because after I watch the movie once you [Mr Shea] explain substances of the movie in easy understanding English. I can understand substances of the movie. - *Shinji*

> Seeing this movie, maybe many people cry. And I realize that everybody has "Field of Dreams" in his or her mind. I think this story is excellent! and this movie hit homer on our mind! - *Hiroaki*

> We can tell about human relations as a metaphor of Catch Ball. Ray's father threw a ball as a expectation to Ray, but Ray refused to catch it when he was seventeen, and his father died. But at the end of the movie, he could catched the ball that his father threw to him... Ray's father felt pain when Ray [doesn't return the ball], and at the same time, Ray himself would felt pain, unconsciously. This pain would turn into he Voice, and talk to him. - *Tagiru*

Hitoshi makes the connection between the film's theme and his own dreams and reality, while Shinji points out how he typically doesn't watch video movies, but given the chance provided in class, he was able not only to appreciate the movie but also have a positive experience in English. What strikes me about Hiroaki's comment is his use of metaphoric image, which is the spark of interesting composition. And Tagiru's identification of the pain of separation between father and son with the mysterious Voice heard in the cornfield is insightful and perceptive, demonstrating his sensitivity to the story's thematic timbre. Each student's focus of attention is different, and what they see and hear in the movie resonates with their own experiences and ideas, but this is the locus of engagement, where language becomes an essential tool of critical thought and a matter of relevance for the students.

I confess that I am not walking around in my underwear by presenting these excerpts.[10] Even though B class is a "low" level group, these are the better students, the basement elite, and I have picked journals to which I responded positively. Yet you can certainly *see the students'* underwear in the form of their less than perfect grammar and stilted expressions. At the same time, their mistakes are outweighed by the depth of the ideas and the quality of the engagement, by the sincerity of opinion and critical reflection. Given time and authentic participation in scaffolded interaction, these students would certainly develop their language fluency.

An important aspect of response is, naturally, what students themselves think, so I asked them. I asked B class, "Do you think it's useful to show movies in your class as we've done this semester?"[11] Most said yes, though for various reasons. Many focused on the entertainment value of film, expressing their sense of relief that English could actually be fun. Some pointed out how movies present the cultural context of language use, while others commented on how the narrative helps situate understanding:

> Of my experiences studying English at this university, using movies has been the most meaningful. This is because through the media of film, I can get directly into English and know the culture of the country where English is spoken as a native language... The best point was probably that we could enjoy ourselves as we studied English. I could understand a little of the enjoyment of studying English.
>
> I think it is very enjoyable to use movies in the English class. Very enjoyable. I could hear interesting lectures and learn living English. I want you to continue.
>
> Through movies, you can enjoy English. It's the most enjoyable way to study English I've experienced.
>
> Watching movies, you can see the gestures and facial expressions, so it helps to understand the dialog. I studied a good deal of grammar in high school, and I don't want to repeat the same kind of class. Even if I don't understand all the grammar and vocabulary of the movie, I think I will develop my listening comprehension.
>
> To use English movie is very interested for me. I do not like study about grammar, because it is so difficult and not so useful thing. So in high school, I did not like English. But now I think I like English, and I can write <...> not so fear about English grammar. I think this writing has many problem, but I can write this by English.
>
> I think that using videos is a very good way to teach, because you can learn

---

[10] As Robert Sukle, one of my Japanese professors, used to say in regard to being self-conscious about one's language use in front of outside observers.

[11] I told students *not* to write their names (some did anyway) and that they could write in Japanese if they preferred. Nearly everyone wrote in Japanese, and all the names are fabricated. Translations are my own.

> English along with the excitement as you are drawn into the movie's world and begin to follow its story.
>
> The material which the teacher prepared (the transcript) helped. At my level, watching videos without subtitles is still too difficult and has no meaning. *Field of Dreams* has many abstract problems so it is a very hard to understand movie, I think. But it is good to use [in class] because the content of the story captures our interest.

Not every comment, however, is positive. Some students doubted the effectiveness of using movies as instructional texts, since they couldn't understand all the words all the time. They felt they relied too much on visual images and guesswork about the dialogue. And, related to this criticism, some students pointed to the extra effort required to deal with movies directly, without subtitles to figure out what's going on, even though they admit that perhaps they ought to go so far as to make the effort:

> I didn't understand the content of the story. It's better to have the Japanese subtitles.
>
> In general, watching movies is not useful. If you don't watch a scene over and over, you can't remember the expressions. To learn English from a movie, you have to watch it on your own many times.
>
> While my effort [to study] was insufficient, I also feel that in one respect, I couldn't keep up with the dialogue [*tuite ikenakatta men ga atta*].

Partly in response to these kinds of comments, I've taken to showing only films which have Japanese subtitles.

Some students pointed out how useful movies can be since they provide background information about the interaction, which helps them better understand the natural give and take of spoken language.

> Usually, we have few opportunities to hear natural English, so my ear is not accustomed to it. I think, "Okay, I'll listen" or "I'll talk," but it doesn't turn out the way I expect, so by using movies in class, my ear becomes tuned and I learn how conversation proceeds.
>
> I cannot learn its intonation from the book. I cannot learn the timing we must say from its book.

I recognize that it's not always advisable to listen to students. Every comment depends on its context and motivation and, while every student writes an opinion, some students are motivated to study and others are motivated to drink, socialize, and read comic books. And a distinction should probably be made between a nineteen year old's heart of hearts, and the heart on his or her sleeve. In their heart of hearts, most college

ESL students really do want to learn English, but in the heart on their sleeve, they seem reluctant to sacrifice the amount of blood the task requires. But overall, I think students' positive response to film is a critical component of motivation and engagement in language study.

Conclusion

I have to admit that, in the end, I have no solid proof I'm right and Nigel's wrong. I recognize that all positions can be deconstructed and their contradictions pointed out, including the classroom practice of responsive engagement to whole movies (see Jeff Cady's article in this volume, for example). As stated above, pedagogic success depends on one's point of view and definition of language. I do think it a valid question to ask whether students benefit from spending forty or more hours a semester under my tutelage. But my doubts are tempered by a theoretical recognition of the primacy of motivation (or orientation) in learning and the necessity of student response. And my worry that I'm not doing enough instruction about language is not as strong as my conviction that a responsive engagement with real stories serves to drive language learning and acquisition of the skills Nigel is spending most of his time teaching. I believe that using whole movies, based on a response-based engagement with ideas and opinions, is not a pedagogical cop-out but a theoretically and empirically sound path to follow in the ESL college classroom. In the end, I find that I can't accept the structuralist neglect of the central importance of aesthetic and authentic narrative, even if it is made in the name of accuracy and efficiency.

A closing illustration: when my B class was watching the last scene of *Field of Dreams*, a movie which no matter how many times I watch, invariably brings me to tears, I had to look out the window and think when Ray asked his dad, who had come back from the grave to play baseball on the field Ray had built, if he wanted to play catch. The movie ends with this scene, and when the classroom lights came on, I was shocked but partly relieved to see a significant number of teary faces in the room among the students. I didn't want to count *how many* faces in front of everyone, and besides, I was busy trying maintain my own composure, but I thought that if response is a critical element in narrative, then many of the students had constructed a profound and moving story. If I had cut up the movie into five minute segments, focusing on the linguistic structure and the form of the language, the students might never have recognized the emotional force and narrative dynamic of the video as a story about important things in the human experience, aesthetic and ethical things like dreams, imagination, and commitment; things that drive language and ultimately stimulate students to learn it in the first place.

References

Casanave, C. (1993). Student Voices: The insiders speak out on journal writing. In C. Casanave (Ed.), *Journal writing: Pedagogical perspectives.* (pp. 95-115). Fujisawa, Japan: Keio University SFC Institute of Languages and Communication. Monograph No. 3

Cazden, C. (1989). *Classroom discourse.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Donato, R. (1994) Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research.* (pp. 33-56). Norwood, NJ: Ablex

Edelsky, C. (1992). *With literacy and justice for all: Rethinking the social in language and education.* London: Falmer Press.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Continuum.

Jorden, E. (1991). The use of interactive video in the learning of Japanese. In B. Freed (Ed.), *Foreign language research in the classroom.* (pp. 384-392). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.* Oxford: Pergamon.

MacGowan-Gilhooly, A. (1991). Fluency first: Reversing the traditional ESL sequence. *Journal of Basic Writing 10(1),* 73-87.

McCornick, A. (1993). Journal writing and the damaged language learner. In C. Casanave (Ed.), *Journal writing: Pedagogical perspectives* (pp. 6-17). Fujisawa, Japan: Keio University SFC Institute of Languages and Communication. Monograph No.3

Palincsar, A. (1986). The role of dialogue in providing scaffolded instruction. *Educational Psychologist 21/1,* 73-98.

Schmidt, R. (1994). Consciousness, learning, and interlanguage pragmatics. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 21-42). New York: Oxford University Press.

Schumann, J. (1978). The acculturation model for second-language acquisition. In R. C. Gingras (Ed.), *Second language acquisition and foreign language teaching.* Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Cambridge: Newbury House.

van Lier, L. (1989). *The classroom and the language teacher: Ethnography and second-language classroom research.* New York: Longman.

Voloshinov, V. (1973). *Marxism and the philosophy of language*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wood, D., Bruner, J. and Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 17, 89-100.

Appendix 1

Talking to a Story[12]

1. What is your first reaction to the movie? (i.e., what are your emotions?)
2. Do you think the movie is a good one or not? Why do you think so?
3. Does the movie remind you of any things in your life, such as sights, sounds, or feelings?
4. Does the movie suggest any thoughts or ideas?
5. What sort of person do you imagine the author to be?
6. Do you feel involved with the movie? Or distant from it?
7. What questions do you have after watching the movie?
8. What image or picture was called to mind by the movie?
9. What is the most important point of the movie?
10. What is the most difficult thing to understand about the movie?
12. Does the movie remind you of another story? What are the similarities and differences?
13. Is there something else about this story not on this list?

[12]Adapted from a handout by Robert Probst (n.d.), Dialog with a text

FILMS IN ENGLISH CLASS: GOING BEYOND A CONTENT APPROACH

Jeffrey Cady

I recently was asked to help out with two film classes planned by some of my colleagues at Keio University, Fujisawa. In the course of the term, I came to realize how much my own approach to using films in class is shaped by my background teaching English in a rather conventional (if communicative) syllabus. I tend to use films in most ways the same way I do textbook tapes, publishers' video materials or TV news stories. My emphasis is on understanding (at least to some extent) the language of the films. I felt, however, that my colleagues at Keio were largely ignoring the films as listening material and taking an approach much closer to the way I would expect them to teach a film course in an American or British University. As it turned out, their expectations for the course were more than linguistic (see Casanave and Freedman in this volume) but the course started me thinking about whether a purely content-based approach to films was better than the one I had always used. When I was asked to contribute to this monograph as well, I found I had to go back to the books and look again at the theory behind both the use of listening materials in class and content based language teaching.

Theoretical Trends Supporting the Use of Films in English Class

Since the seventies, and the interest created by Stephen Krashen's emphasis on the importance of input in language learning, the attention in the classroom to listening for its own sake has increased, and there has certainly been a shift in the kinds of recorded support materials used. During my own career the main published recorded materials available have changed from audio-lingual drills to relatively naturalistic studio dialogues and I see ever increasing use of various kinds of "authentic" recordings among my colleagues, including unscripted dialogues and discussions and recordings originally produced for native speakers: radio news, dramas, television entertainments and even complete films.[1] Despite the occasional protests of those students that prefer the "easier", scripted, slow-spoken, pre-digested, traditional dialogues, the trend in listening materials seems to be clearly toward sampling reality in one form or another.

At the same time that listening materials have been moving more toward the real world, for a number of years theorists in second language acquisition have supported the

[1]The widespread availability of cheap audio and video technology in recent decades has certainly contributed to this. For the legal aspects of this trend, see Simons in this volume.

notion that the best way of studying a foreign language may in fact be to study something else *in* that language. In the 70s, H.G. Widdowson, among others, proposed that students of English should be taught through "the other subjects on the school curriculum" (Widdowson, 1978, p.16). His concern was that much teaching at that time was based on the teaching of language *usage*, "the citation of words and sentences as manifestations of the language system" as opposed to language *use*, "the way the system is realized for normal communicative purposes" (Widdowson 1978, p.18). We were teaching *about* language rather than *how to do* language and what we were teaching about language wasn't even the whole story. Students were learning how nouns and verbs were joined together properly, but not how they were used to deal with the world. Widdowson observed that a usage approach dealt with language only at the level of word or sentence, while it was becoming more and more evident that this was not sufficient to explain (nor, probably to teach) language use. In the last couple of decades, both teachers and language theorists have been forced to acknowledge the importance of discourse considerations, the larger contexts that give meaning to grammar and vocabulary. Many have accepted the importance to language teaching of cohesion, genre, the mechanics of conversational interaction and other aspects of "communicative competence" (e.g. Brown, 1980; Savignon, 1983). Some have gone so far as to assert that practicing particular elements of language is either essentially useless or at least is less effective than learning through some kind of actual communication[2] .

In recent years we've seen two areas of practice emerge directly from the insights of Widdowson and the other theorists. On the one hand, content classes mostly avoid the issue of explicit teaching of language. In fact, research (reviewed by Ellis, 1994) seemed to show that traditional approaches to explaining or drilling particular points of grammar are problematic or don't work. These findings together with the complexity of the discourse view of language, may have initially discouraged some people from hoping that a similarly explicit approach would work any better at the discourse level. Content teaching offered a straightforward way of introducing natural use into the classroom.

On the other hand, many teachers, unwilling to abandon teaching language directly, have discovered that non-content communicative teaching of many sorts *is* possible and in fact "communicative" has become a buzz-word for publishers of English language materials. Simulations and information gap activities create a kind of real communication in the classroom, skills training in reading, writing, speaking and listening give much more attention to function and context than before. There is finally some research support

---

[2]Ellis (1994), cites Krashen (1982) for the stronger position, and Prabhu (1987), for the weaker. More recently, Krashen seems to have somewhat softened his position to allow the explicit teaching of some elements, if not grammar (Krashen, 1985). Ellis himself seems to support a modification of the weaker view (see below).

for the feeling of many teachers that carefully designed explicit teaching of language can work (Ellis, 1994). Indeed, Widdowson allows that a use-based approach "does not mean that exercises in particular aspects of usage cannot be introduced where necessary" (Widdowson, 1978, p.19). He was making room for grammar practice, but "exercises" no longer has to mean just audio-lingual drilling (communicative *grammar* teaching is enjoying a certain amount of popularity lately), nor does focusing on particular aspects of language have to mean studying grammar at all. It can mean studying appropriateness, function or cultural differences or any other aspect of language in context. Though Krashen rejected "fine tuning" of input (meaning trying to adapt input to focus on particular grammatical points), he didn't reject every kind of intervention. On the contrary, he regarded adjusting the level of difficulty, and giving attention to context -- creating "comprehensible input" as essential (Krashen, 1987).[3] Ellis (1994), after surveying the current research reaches the (admittedly cautious) position that:

> Facilitating selective attention by devising instructional activities that equip learners with conscious rules, or that help them interpret the meanings of specific forms in the input, is both psycholinguistically feasible and possible in practical terms (p.657).

To come back to my question about how best to teach a film class, Widdowson proposed that content-based teaching would provide an automatic context for language use which is both natural and familiar to students in school and may be more relevant to the learner than other approaches. He asserted that the learning experienced in it is more immediate in that it corresponds with the way the learners use their own language in the study of other subjects. That students see film as relevant (and interesting) makes film courses a natural subject for content courses but also a natural focus of the trend to authentic listening. Theorists are urging us to provide learners with lots of "input" that they can understand, and giving us some leeway to teach language explicitly. Theory tells us that content classes, like other classes for language learners, need to supply learners with comprehensible input, and it does not exclude helping learners to notice and interpret the ways language is used. If these concerns apply to that part of a film class where we talk about the film, should they not also apply to viewing the film itself? If we can manage it, shouldn't we try to give some attention to the language in the films we study and also to making the language easier for our students to understand?

---

[3]Michael Rost (1990) warns of the dangers of "easification" that distorts the language that students receive or dilutes the authenticity of their interaction with it, but he is mostly concerned about conversational interactions where native speakers are modifying the language they produce, trying to make it easier to understand. The language of films remains "genuine", but the teacher must have some concern for the "authenticity" of the students' interactions with it--not to lose track of the usual relations between films and their viewers. See my comments about control below.

For a More Language-Intensive Approach to Film

Interest in so-called content-based EFL (English as a Foreign Language) teaching has increased, and attempts to actually try it out have been made (in Japan perhaps encouraged by the habit of universities and, recently high schools, of hiring foreign teachers whose specialties are outside the teaching of English as a foreign language). But as Bernard Mohan (1986) puts it "While the need for coordinating the learning of language and subject matter is generally recognized, just how this should be accomplished remains a problem" (p. iii). Often EFL teachers don't feel competent to teach in another field and non-EFL teachers struggle with how to adapt their teaching to learners for whom the main learning difficulties are linguistic. The area where we may find most cases of EFL teachers teaching content may be film, both as part of more traditional language courses and as separate film-only courses.

Most of the papers in this monograph address film classes essentially as ordinary content classes, more or less as if we were teaching geography or literature or cooking, where the fact that the objects under study are in some way themselves linguistic objects has small relevance to the way the class is designed. Their concern is with what the film is about or how it was done--with the meaning of the whole film. Students may see quite a few films in a term, where comprehension of the film's language is dealt with as a side issue. Although they are encouraged to watch the films again on their own, very little attention is given to the language of the film, as language, except in the same way it might be dealt with in a film class for native speakers. In fact I've come to realize that I have no serious quarrel with this approach; it allows a maximum of attention to other very important aspects of the films, such as style, message, viewer's reaction, cultural implications and so on, and the original theoretical arguments for teaching through content hold up pretty well. Theory, however, does not limit us to this sort of arms-length approach. There is support for a language based treatment that both makes the films' language more comprehensible as input and that talks explicitly about the language and the rules that govern it (whether grammatical or discoursal). A more intensive approach to film language is not incompatible with other aspects of film study (except, perhaps in terms of time available). Furthermore, if we believe that input is important to language learning, by neglecting a film's language we may be missing an opportunity that films especially offer in the classroom. Compared to almost anything else, whether textbooks, a blackboard, posters, magazines and newspapers, "realia" props, even invited speakers or a library, films are a fantastic resource for language in the classroom. As listening material they are in many ways almost ideal, offering us a vast range of

language, in context, complete with the best, most complete settings, both ordinary and extraordinary that Hollywood (or the studios at Pinewood, or Cinecitta or Toei) can construct, built-in character and motivation for each situation, with discourse features suitable for analysis at every level. They are often better written and certainly better illustrated than any textbook dialogue, and they cover an enormous linguistic territory, from "ET call home" to "Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune..." to "Hoo-ahh".

As language vehicles, films are also very attractive to our students, whether in some cases because of enormous advertising budgets, famous faces, and slick production, or in other cases for the almost opposite reasons that attract students to cult films and obscure documentaries. Not only are films at the heart of mass culture right next to television, but they also exist at the fringes of culture and have a respectability among students that TV may not. They offer students a chance to study language through something that is at the same time fun and serious, authentic and innovative, more demanding than television, but less intimidating than pages of printed text. We may wonder though if it is possible to study a whole film in the intensive way that we treat other listening materials.

Practical Considerations for an Intensive Approach

Why haven't films completely taken over language classrooms? Or why do film content classes shy away from dealing with the language in the films? There are several apparent difficulties that may discourage teachers. Some of these look serious at first regard but may not be as great as they seem. Several more are important, but can in many cases be reduced or overcome.

Isn't the Language Too Difficult?

There is not only a huge amount of language in any film, but the language situations are complex, the language is hard (and it certainly doesn't fit very well into any traditional language syllabus sequence), and dealing with it takes a lot of time. A typical scene in a good film can be fantastically more complicated than a textbook dialogue. Not only may there be far more details visible (and audible) than even in a video teaching dialogue, but these details have meaning, and these meanings interact with each other. A film audience might be expected to notice what she's wearing, her running mascara or that he hesitates for a long time before he continues after he says "A coffee and..." We may need to know quite a bit more about the people involved because there's probably more going on than it just being lunch time.

This seeming drawback may be a bonus, however. Our students may be limited in what they know about English, but they've grown up with film and television and the greater part of the vocabulary of film is entirely international. They know what a tense confrontation or a love scene looks like--even an American love scene (or a French one for that matter). They've been trained by experience, the same as we have, to respond to camera angles, editing pace and music. Furthermore, if the students know that the focus is on a particular language point, they may be willing to accept some fuzziness around the cultural or dramatic edges and vice-versa. If you simply point out the cocktail dress, the hesitation, the lifted eyebrow, guessing is sometimes as good as knowing. And on the other hand, the vivid reminder that a conversation has meaning, that it occurs in a particular situation, said by particular people for a reason, transforms it as a teaching vehicle. If you've ever led a patient but uninspired class through the first repetition of a dialogue and then seen them come awake just from being forced to include "umm" at the beginning of one of the sentences, or to stress one word a little differently, or to make a minor gesture at the *right* moment, you've seen how the life of language is in these details and so, maybe, have they.

The difficulty of the language in a film may not be as great as it at first seems, either. In fact, once the characters, their motivation, the setting and so on have been dealt with, such a traditional language teacher concern as grammar often turns out not to be such a great issue in comprehension. And some films are much less difficult than others. The density and complexity of the language varies a great deal according to whether the film is intended for general audiences, whether the story is complicated and how much of it is told visually, the amount of action, the period, the number of characters involved, their accents, whether the characters and situations are ordinary (family members, household settings vs. lawyers in courtrooms, etc.), and the number and importance of topical references. Exotic accents, mistaken identities, topical comedies are hard. Mysteries can leave students worried that the one word they don't know is a crucial verbal clue (though they should be able to count on the teacher to keep them current), while, on the other hand, in a science fiction film they know that some of the words will be new to native speakers as well! Comedy may be mostly topical or it may be highly visual or almost entirely based on very ordinary language.

The very attractiveness of films can help to make them easier. Rost (1990) points out that "[Listening] texts which are vivid or interesting may be easy to understand even though they contain unfamiliar content or difficult language features," and also "Listeners may expend more effort on a difficult text provided the text offers useful and informative insights" (p.159).

Making the Language Easier

When the language is *too* difficult, yet crucial to understanding an important scene in the film, if there is time, it can still be dealt with without resorting to devices such as subtitles. Over the last decade or two a range of techniques has been developed for making difficult recorded texts more accessible to students' understanding. Some of these approaches, traditional or recently developed, break a seemingly difficult listening task down into something that learners, even at a fairly low level can deal with.[4] Thes approaches include pre-listening exercises and discussion, and methods of presentation that separate the obstructions of context from those of the language itself (such as viewing the scene first silently), or that supply some or all of the language on paper, with or without explanation of crucial vocabulary and usage. We should remember also that both from a theoretical and a practical point of view there is probably no necessity of the students *producing* the same level of language as we are asking them to listen to.

Won't It Ruin the Excitement?

There is a danger, in examining scenes and the language in them in detail that we will neglect one other aspect of a film--its pace. In fact, films are not really made to be watched in small pieces and viewers' interest will not survive too much attention to detail. But in intermediate to advanced classes a balance is achievable, if we work with both the interesting fine points and with complete scenes, if students always have a chance to view the forest as well as some of the trees, and if we are careful not to forget about movement and suspense. Indeed we can put suspense back in where slow comprehension has lagged behind and missed it. With the lowest level students, however, a 90 or 120 minute movie can drag on forever if we attempt too much.

Letting go

After presenting some techniques and worksheets at a teachers' conference a year or so ago, I was taken to task a bit by someone who had been at the presentation. He was concerned that the work was so *controlled*. I think he was partly concerned about my looking so closely at detail (what I presented in the conference was mostly limited to exercises that focused the students on particular details and ignored the larger picture), but he may also have been referring to a more general consideration. As we may want to give

[4]For video techniques see Lonergan (1984), Cooper, Lavery, & Rinvolucri (1991), and for general listening skills many recent textbooks, including Richards, Gordon & Harper (1987), Viney & Viney (1986), and Soars & Soars (1986).

our film classes opportunity to ask the wider questions and look more at the overall meaning of the work, we should give them more control over how the inquiry is conducted as well--to let them control their own learning. This can have value in any kind of film class.

Part of the value of interaction in language class is the importance of giving learners control of input. In discussion this means the teacher giving up control and in listening it is the same. At the conference, in trying to present twenty-some exercises for film comprehension in 45 minutes, I may have given a rather teacher-centered presentation. But where the control rests will depend on how we use the tools available. Simply stopping the film and playing a scene again has already shifted control away from the makers of the film to the teacher. Giving the remote control to the students shifts it the rest of the way. Other methods involve letting students decide the questions, letting them choose how much to watch and how long to focus on a section, even letting them choose the film. Student presentations (about language or, of course, other aspects of the film) likewise put control and a chance for creativity back into student hands. Student control can be crucial to sustaining interest too.

Does This Take a Lot of Time?

The one aspect of a language intensive approach to film study that is not vulnerable to theoretical insights or modern strategies is that it does take time. An intensive approach somewhat similar to those used for purpose-made language teaching videos or for listening to recorded news, divides a full-length film into 10-12 two hour intermediate level lessons, including time to view each one week's 8-12 minute section several times, do vocabulary and comprehension work and some general discussion. This is a lot of time spent on one film and may vary with the level of the students, the film chosen and so on. It can involve a lot of preparation for just one teacher as well, although the same film can be used in other terms or with other classes. The time devoted can also vary with the amount of attention teacher (and students) want to devote to the language of the film. Although I'm arguing the advantages of an intensive approach, there's no reason to make the issue black and white. A friend who teaches at a language school successfully teaches intermediate non-college students to view and enjoy English language films with very little language support by concentrating on general comprehension and does it in less time. This requires, however, a deft touch and a good knowledge of one's students. If other factors demand it (teacher or student interest, curriculum, administration), more or less attention can be given to language vs. other aspects of film study, from an intensive approach to one that deals with film language only when it is significant in some way to

any audience (the future language of *Clockwork Orange* or *1984* for example).

Conclusion.

A language-intensive approach to film does take time. It is also true that students can often appreciate a film and learn from it even if their level of comprehension of the English in it is not high. But it is hard to justify the view that some greater understanding of the language, or more detailed examination of its component parts, and the ways in which these parts relate to their contexts in a general way, will not contribute quite a bit to their study of the film if the opportunity is there. Furthermore, many of our students, even in universities, come to English class primarily because they are interested in the language as language, and may be resistant to a content approach that doesn't take this into account. In truth, lots of our students aren't interested in film as art. Some of our students are only interested in karate movies. (though they may see them as art). And there are many teachers who don't feel competent to teach film as art either, or in fact as anything but language.

In fact while I now think it is possible to choose (and justify) either a purely whole-film approach (e.g., film criticism) or a very intensive, language based approach, there is a lot of of middle ground available. Though, on the one hand, the content approach can often benefit from greater attention to language, on the other hand, it will be a great waste if we go too far the other way and treat films simply as splendid language samples. Just as a text dialogue is hollow without some kind of transference to a real situation, we need to follow up on our intensive attention to form and intonation with discussions at least of how we relate to the story on the screen (the open questions *why?* and *what if?* as well as the closed *what*? and *when*? and *where*?), and very possibly we need to pay some attention as to how the scenes and the language in them are shaped by the technique of writer, director and actors.

My return to the language theory books has given me renewed respect for teaching content in language classrooms. I am beginning to think again about ways that I can make language learning work more below the surface by teaching it less directly, and possibly with the outward focus on learning other subjects. Nonetheless, I feel strongly that language teaching theory can also justify the more intensive approach to films I've used myself for a number of years. I think that this approach is feasible in a practical way and offers resources and possibilities that are otherwise difficult to duplicate, and that teachers should use films when they can as a *source* of language for study to the great benefit of their students.

References

Brown, D (1980). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Cooper, R., Lavery, M., & Rinvolucri, M. (1991). *Video*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. London: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. D. (1985). *Inquiries and insights*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Alemany Press, Prentice Hall Regents.

Lonergan, J. (1984). *Video in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mohan, B. (1986). *Language and content*. Reading, MA.: Addison Wesley Publishing.

Richards, J., Gordon, G., & Harper, A. (1987). *Listen for it*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rost, M. (1990). *Listening in language learning*. Harlow, Essex: Longman Press.

Savignon, S. (1983) *Communicative competence: theory and classroom practice*. Reading, MA.: Addison Wesley.

Soars, J., & Soars, L., (1986). *Headway, Intermediate*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Viney, P., & Viney, K. (1986). *A weekend away*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Widdowson, H. G. (1978). *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

LEARNING BY COLLABORATION AND TEACHING: A FILM PRESENTATION PROJECT

Christine Pearson Casanave and David Freedman

What Motivated This Project?

In the fall semester of 1993, we asked each of three classes of students to choose a film, analyze it, and present ("teach") their results to each other in a large group setting. We were led initially to this film presentation project because we faced a systemic problem at the university that we needed to solve--namely, too many students and not enough teachers to give classes as small as we wanted. Because students had class three times a week, we were able to toy with a number of possible solutions, and decided to experiment with a large-class/small-class combination. For the large class, we combined the three smaller classes of about 35 students each at the same level and used the time to show films, which many of us do in our smaller classes anyway. Ideally, we argued, the films would constitute input (of content, primarily) for work that would then be done in the smaller "core" classes, which tend to focus on critical thinking skills at the intermediate-advanced levels. In these classes, English is the medium rather than the object of instruction, and multi-skill language instruction occurs as a consequence of our focus on nonlinguistic matters.

Why did we choose films as the main source of content? In the project we report on here, the structural constraint that we faced made films an ideal source of content. By showing films in a large lecture hall, we could be sure that all 100+ students would have the grounding they needed for the further work that would take place in the core classes. The content of the films was also accessible to all students, regardless of proficiency, because we used subtitled versions. Finally, well-chosen films are interesting to many more young people than are books, regrettable as this may seem to some. They are also interesting to teachers, as lively lunch room conversations on our campus on the topic of films have demonstrated.

Teaching, Learning, and Collaborating

This project pushed us to rethink our notions of teaching, learning, and collaborative group work. Before discussing the specifics of what students did, we lay out some of these notions as a way to ground our discussion in issues that turned out to be important in helping us understand what worked and did not work in the project.

In the first place, we found it hard to separate teaching and learning into distinct sets of activities carried out by different kinds of people, teachers and students. In language learning, as in other kinds of learning, we recognized that we as teachers often seem to learn more than our students do. The activity of teaching, we reasoned, results in high quality learning because the teacher-learner does all the work essential for good learning: researching, organizing, and communicating ideas to and with others. Indeed, all of us who teach have probably experienced regularly the pleasures and surprises of learning something new as we prepare materials to teach or as we interact with interested students and are forced to articulate our knowledge in response to their (and our own) questions and confusions. For most of us, the activities of preparing to teach and teaching result in deeper and longer lasting learning for us than did our own past classroom learning experiences.

What are some of the characteristics that distinguish this kind of learning from traditional information-transfer learning? First, as teachers we know how to access the resources we need to prepare to teach. These resources include not only books, journals, and professional meetings, but also colleagues with whom we interact. We do not work in isolation. Second, we are highly motivated to prepare lessons in ways that will be optimally accessible to people who we presume do not already know the material or skill we are teaching. The audience, in other words, is real, and has reasons (intrinsic or extrinsic) for learning. Third, the activities of preparing to teach and teaching demand that teachers exercise a wide range of linguistic, cognitive, social, and creative skills. Fourth, we feel accountable and responsible not only for our own performance, but also for ensuring that others (i.e., students) progress. In the stereotypical student role, on the other hand, the student feels responsible only for him or herself. Finally, we are not tested artificially on what we learn by teaching. Awareness of our successes consists, rather, in evidence from ongoing implicit and explicit evaluation from our classes, such as knowing that we have held the attention of our audience, helped them see something in a new way, or inspired them to continue learning. It also consists in a very nontrivial marker of success--our own growth in knowledge and interest in a particular content area. Why, then, do we not routinely construct learning opportunities for our students that mirror some of these fundamental facts about the close ties between teaching and learning? The brief literature review that follows, particularly that on cooperative/collaborative learning, captures some of the ideas we wish to ground our thinking in, and suggests some of these ties.

Some Ideas from the Literature

There are many conceptions of learning, but they share the notion that some kinds of learning involve memorizing and quantitative increases in knowledge (of facts, procedures) and that other kinds are more abstract, involving so-called higher order skills such as interpreting reality and conceptualizing. In all cases, we can say that learning involves some kind of change. But deep learning, in which people use synthetic, analytic, and abstracting skills in order to reorganize and interpret information, is prized because it is thought to be longer lasting than surface learning, as well as more closely connected to meaning, comprehension, interest, and motivation.

In the school setting, according to Kember and Gow (1994), "...these conceptions of learning are important because of the evidence that they have a strong influence upon the study approach students use for particular study tasks" (p. 58). For example, in a surface approach to studying, students try to memorize material on which they will be tested. In a deep approach, they focus on the meaning of reading material or of project work (Kember & Gow, p. 59). In particular, Kember and Gow found that interactive teaching methods, rather than teacher-fronted lectures where information is delivered in a one-way fashion, encouraged students to study deeply, with interest and enthusiasm.

How, then, have educators designed interactive teaching and learning activities? Some of the most effective interactive learning has been found to occur in small, cooperative learning groups (Cohen, 1986; Johnson & Johnson, 1994; Slavin, R., 1983). Cohen (1994) defines cooperative learning as "students working together in a group small enough that everyone can participate on a collective task that has been clearly assigned" (p. 3). In such groups, particularly when the mix of students is heterogeneous, and the goals and group members are interdependent (i.e., when the task cannot be completed by individuals working alone), students not only learn from each other, but they also create knowledge that none of the members had before. (Both Cohen [1986] and Johnson and Johnson [1994] point out that the benefits of group work do not accrue automatically, but that students need to learn the social and discourse skills necessary to work together effectively.)

One experiment demonstrates the potential of cooperative learning groups to foster high quality learning in at least some situations. In a pre-service teacher education program, Wedman, Hughes, and Robinson (1993) taught students in each of two sections of a reading methods course to use reading inventory procedures. One group received direct instruction through lectures. The other learned how to use and understand reading inventory procedures in cooperative learning groups. In post-tests and follow-up

questionnaires, the experimental cooperative learning group achieved significantly higher scores, and believed that working in a group benefitted their learning in ways that lectures alone could not.

Related to cooperative learning is another approach referred to as a "workshop" approach, which most closely resembles the approach we took in this film presentation project. In the university setting in which they worked, Arredondo and Rucinski (1994) designed a workshop approach that consisted of the following key elements: 1) reflective journals, 2) individual student-professor conferences, 3) structured small group discussions of project work, and 4) final presentation of the student projects to the whole class (Arredondo & Rucincski, 1994, p. 274). Their purpose was to involve students "...in complex projects requiring the meaningful use of language" (p. 275). At the conclusion of five university education classes, both graduate and undergraduate, where this approach was used, the authors learned from questionnaires that most students favored this approach to a more passive approach. Graduate students responded somewhat more favorably than undergraduates, however, and ratings were highest when the professors' guidelines and expectations were clearly laid out. While a few students in this survey preferred listening to lectures, writing individual reports, and taking tests, most students appreciated the workshop approach for helping increase the depth of their thinking, their creativity, and their motivation.

For our purposes in our SFC English classes, the second language acquisition literature on the topic of interactive teaching and learning is less helpful than that described above. The main reason is that the bulk of the second language literature concerns language acquisition in a much narrower sense than we are interested in. In this literature (some of which is described or presented in Allwright and Bailey [1991], Kessler [1992], Nunan [1992], and the October 1994 issue of *The Language Teacher*) researchers and teachers are concerned with the amount and quality of linguistic input and output and their relation to students' language development. The same concern is manifested in the work on task-based learning (e.g, Nunan, 1989). We believe that students' language will develop as it is used for meaningful purposes (Krashen, 1987) such as (in our case in Japan) work on a long-term project. We are also less concerned with students' linguistic proficiency than are some English programs in Japan, and more with what we call "educational growth"--the development of curiosity, critical and analytical thinking ability, and skill in problem posing and exploration (Casanave, 1992). For these reasons, we have found that the general education literature fits our purposes better than does the literature in second language education.

Our point is that teachers, as a normal part of our class preparations, do what is necessary for good learning to take place. We select, collaborate, confer, revise,

organize, synthesize, and articulate. In the traditional language class, indeed, the traditional class of any kind, students rarely do this. It is in this sense, then, that we use the expression "learning by teaching." We want students to do what all of us do every day, and by doing so to begin developing the same sense of interest and confidence in, as well as responsibility for, their own knowledge that we as teachers gain as a result of our teaching. In the context of the film course that we devised for our third semester sophomore students, we felt we had the opportunity to experiment with some of these ideas.

The Students, Class Structure, and Presentation Assignment

Our students during the film presentation semester consisted of three high-intermediate university English classes (called EI, EJ, and EK, TOEFL mid to high 400s) that met together once a week to view films as part of the class structure described above. The film segment was run by a part-time teacher with whom we consulted regularly. We selected films based on the theme of "The Human Dilemma," how individuals react to and handle major crises in their lives, and showed one film every 2-3 weeks in a large theater-style room. All films were in English, subtitled in Japanese, and included *Mermaids*, *Dominick and Eugene*, *Talent for the Game*, and *Witness*.

In the second half of the semester, students also worked on their final presentations. We often have students do final oral presentations rather than take a final exam, and we reasoned that it made a great deal of sense to have the three classes present to each other rather than to themselves. Therefore, in a final project, each class selected its own film for a 100-minute presentation to the other classes. Each presentation was to contain a summary, an analysis, a pro-con critique, and visuals. Beyond these basic requirements, the students were fairly much on their own as to how they would divide the work and what the specific content would be. Students worked primarily outside of class on this presentation, but we did some of the groundwork in class, as well as set interim deadlines for them (not always followed, of course).

Regular Core Class Activities

When the three classes met separately once a week in their core classes, we followed up on the films that were shown with a variety of activities that were designed to help students use English to practice the kinds of thinking the would need for their final presentations, and to make the film viewing itself a more "active" (participatory) process. For example, for each film we designed film-viewing worksheets that covered plot and

character development of the narrative line (summary), exploration of the issues or dilemmas faced by the characters (analysis), and "open" questions on individual reactions to the film--with reasons explained (critique). Also, we required that students read a published film review (e.g., Roger Ebert) for each film, and helped them see the elements of summary, analysis, and critique in those reviews. This approach helped us structure the discussion in the core classes so that we could concentrate on these three aspects of reviewing. Further, this style of reviewing, we presumed, would help students prepare for their final presentation project, where they, as a class, would review a film of their choice and teach what they had learned to the other two classes.

Journals were a useful medium in which students could develop their ideas, and we required that students write at least one journal on every film. In Chris Casanave's class (EK), students wrote once a week, alternating between a response journal and a summary. In David Freedman's classes (EI, EJ), in the first journal the emphasis was on summary. The students were asked to briefly tell the story of the film. In the next journal along with the summary an analysis of the main character was called for (Why, do you think... would you?). In the third journal a critique of the film techniques had to be added (music, acting, writing, directing, and so on). In both Chris's and David's classes, the students had the Roger Ebert review of each film to use as a model; also the questions on the film viewing guide acted as a starting point for the students' writings. Before or after collecting the journals, we asked students to discuss their ideas from them in small groups. In order to keep the discussions in English and to lower anxiety about speaking, students were allowed to "read" their opinions from their journals. In the activity of small group journal sharing, we hoped to encourage the students not only to make public their opinions, but also to begin to see how they could eventually collaborate as a group to present a coherent view of different aspects of a film for their final presentation.

Preparing for the Final Presentations

To prepare for the presentations, at about mid-semester, each class chose a film that dealt with some kind of "human dilemma." The students had been given a project worksheet outlining the requirements for their project. In the 100-minute class period, each class was to present a summary, an analysis, and a pro/con critique of their film; distribute a handout that would help convey the presenters' main points to the audience; and integrate visuals with their presentation, such as video clips and transparencies for the overhead projector. Each student had to sign up for one of the work groups that they devised for themselves. The groups consisted of 4-6 people, which the students called

by a name such as Summary, Character Analysis, Critique, Technical Aspects, Handouts and OHP, and Video Clips. Each class also chose two overall coordinators, and each small group chose a group leader, and conferred with other groups as necessary to design a presentation that would not be fragmented or repetitive.

As we mentioned, most of the specific work that students did for their final presentations took place outside of class. However, in addition to the general activities mentioned above, we helped students in more specific ways. David experimented with the activity and concept of "teaching" in one of his classes, by having small group mini-presentations where the group had to teach a skill to the rest of the class. The groups were required to have both written and oral directions, but the subject was left open with the proviso that at the end of the "lesson" the other students had to have either a physical object or a new skill. Some of the presentations were Making Okonomiyaki, How to Tie a Scarf, and Doing Calligraphy. The short detour into teaching a concrete skill with its preparations helped the class understand the idea of teaching, and, indeed, the final project of this class stood out in terms of how the students explained concepts and found creative ways to get their ideas across.

In Chris's class, the students also gave mini-presentations as they began organizing the various parts of their presentations. These helped students become comfortable speaking in front of a group, develop appropriate eye contact, learn to modulate their voices, learn to solicit questions and comments, and in general to make contact with their audience in ways that encourage a teaching-learning interaction. Chris also gave students some time in class to work in their small groups and to collaborate with other groups so that they could coordinate potentially overlapping aspects of their presentation.

Both of us encouraged the students to prepare their handouts ahead of time so that we could assist with proofreading, but only one of the three groups did this. We also copied the handouts (last minute) for each group, as well as evaluation sheets for the audience to fill out. We graded the small groups of students holistically, and averaged this with other elements on which students were evaluated individually (e.g., attendance, participation, and journal submissions).

Critical Discussion of the Presentation Projects

At this point, in order to comprehend the struggle for meaning that each group brought to their final presentation, it may be worthwhile to listen to the language of a film critic. Maya Deren in her seminal essay, " Cinematography: The Creative Use of Reality" (1960/1985) writes, "As we watch a film, the continuous act of recognition in which we are involved is like a strip of memory unrolling beneath the images of the film

itself, to form *the invisible underlayer of an implicit double exposure*" (italics ours) (p. 56). Our students, like most people, tend to watch films purely as passive entertainment. But in our class this semester, students were pushed to bring a deeper meaning to films--a second layer of exposure, so to speak--that they otherwise would have watched only for fun. In other words, we expected students to be active viewers, who brought their own meanings to the films, whatever those meanings might be. It is this struggle to make the invisible meaning visible that thrusts the students into the very heart of language and teaching.

We had purposely left students on their own to engage in the struggle of selecting, developing, and organizing issues from their films. It was in this preparatory work, where students worked together to construct their own meanings and develop mediums to communicate them effectively, that we hoped the main benefit of the "teaching" aspect of the project would reside. It was our belief that the presentations would reveal the kinds of thinking and organizing that had gone into their preparation.

On each of the three presentation days at the end of the semester, groups from each class had set up the video equipment, OHP, microphones, and lights. One group had even set up several extra TV monitors in the auditorium, in addition to the main screen on stage, "in order to attract attention," a boy explained. Each group passed out its handout and evaluation forms to the audience and took charge of quieting the room. The presenting class sat up front, and each small group came forward to do its part. For the most part, the presenters read from scripts they had prepared, and coordinated their speaking parts with video clips and OHP transparencies that other students were managing.

EK class presented first. They had chosen *Fried Green Tomatoes*, a film about the identity struggles of two generations of women in the American South. The concept they had developed for the film was two-fold. First, they saw the narrative structure as a parallel construction of past and present stories. They very effectively communicated this concept through the use of video and commentary in their summary section. Second, they tried to develop the idea of the relative nature of truth from the perspectives of different characters. This was presented via handouts and lecture, but was not communicated nearly so effectively. A possible cause could be that this concept did not fit a "multi-media" presentation (a topic that enjoys great popularity on our campus, to be discussed further below), and the students could not find alternative resources to present their ideas.

EI class presented *Awakenings*, a film about an alienated doctor who becomes involved in the lives of his "awakening" catatonic patients. EI's main concept was that the narrative should be viewed through the characters as representatives of groups (i.e., patients, doctors, parents, etc.), rather than as individuals. Once again the main method

of teaching in their presentation was through film clips, though enlivened by students appearing in costume to present the story from the viewpoint of their "group." Their secondary theme, the role of windows in the film, was brought forward visually (via video), but the students were unable to initiate a discussion of the meaning of this symbolism, perhaps due to a lack of specific vocabulary for discussing symbolism in film.

EJ class presented last. Their film, *A Few Good Men*, is a film about the conflicts between duty and honor, truth and loyalty in the Marine Corps. Their interpetation hinged on the personal and psychological motives of the main characters, and how they interacted with and exploited each other. The students used an OHP presentation and handouts to demonstrate the "lines of relationship" that they saw in the film. While this method had helped them as a class to clarify their ideas, they were unable effectively communicate their concepts because the key diagram on these visuals lacked the clarity of their preparatory discussion in class. They lost sight of the fact that their final understanding of their concepts of the film had been reached via a process of learning that their audience had not shared. Consequently, we can see that while each class struggled within itself to elucidate a theme, and did so fairly successfully, each class, when faced with the task of effectively explaining their ideas and engaging the audience in a further exploration of their theme, was not so successful.

As we look critically at this learning-by-teaching project, we find that we have questions about many aspects of it. Perhaps the greatest problem was over the amount of target language necessary to work in class and do the project. Some terms were given in vocabulary sections on the viewing sheets, but at the end, when the students became involved in their projects, their concepts outstripped their linguistic skills and left some parts of the final presentations unclear and weak. The question remains as to whether it would have been better to preteach some specific, higher analytical vocabulary (such as the language of the visual symbolism of windows for EI, or the language to allow EK to develop the concept of women nurturing women), or whether the decision to offer the teacher-as-resource (which is more consistent philosophically with the collaborative goals of the class) was the better choice. We were disappointed that few groups used the opportunity offered by the teacher-as-resource, even for proof-reading their handouts.

A problem brought up by the students in their final journal was the feeling that some students worked while others loafed, and the class, as a whole, had no means of forcing a classmate to participate. This problem remains to be solved in classes using large group work as a final project. However, one comment was nearly universal on an end of course questionnaire. When asked if they felt they learned anything from the course, 80% said they had learned presentation skills and felt more confident speaking (as

opposed to 15% who said they had learned critic's skills). Even if the students did not end up exactly where we wanted them to go, the teaching process brought its own lessons to the students.

A larger issue concerns the basic concept of learning-by-teaching. Our idea was that if we allow the students to choose their own material (film) and to find issues on their own with relatively little guidance from teachers, they would develop their own concepts that they would then want to communicate to the other students. The difficulty that the students had in achieving this goal does not negate the method. In fact, perhaps one of the most exciting aspects of this project was to watch students come up with ways to think about their films that we had not thought of, and to watch them struggling to find and articulate their ideas. Our own views of what was needed to be analyzed and critiqued often went unheeded. And in spite of our desire to help students find the "real" meaning in the film, and analyze and critique the film in ways that showed they had read and understood Roger Ebert's film review, and our guiding comments to this end, they went their own way. In the end, we had to allow them to do this, and to respect their solutions, as long as we knew they had genuinely struggled with ideas in the film and with how to present their ideas most effectively to an audience other than themselves.

Our biggest disappointments and praises came, paradoxically, in the same two areas. In the case of Chris, she was both amazed at and disappointed in her class's summary section. It was smooth, clear, and extraordinarily well presented as a combination of narration and video clips, the technology of which was faultless. At the same time, she felt that the efforts that went into the summary, particularly the media aspect, were made at the expense of what she had hoped would be deeper thinking and engagement with broader meanings in the film, the kind of thinking that some of the individual students exhibited in their journal responses throughout the semester. But in the final presentation, only a few students in the whole group seemed to reach any level of profundity. In many ways, students' journals on other films showed more of this kind of insightful, analytical thinking than did their final presenation.

Related to this, was the students' infatuation with media itself, not surprising given that "multimedia" is THE buzzword on our campus. We see lots of showy technology--students learning computer graphics, computer music, data base technology, video making and editing, and so on, but it is not yet clear whether the mechanics of our high tech campus are diverting our students' attention from serious intellectual pursuits to flash and hype. In this project, we saw more flash in some cases than depth of thought. At the same time, we can praise the students' ability to put together a coordinated "show" (if you will), a task that may be neither deeply intellectual nor English-language oriented, but one that does require intensive collaboration, negotiation, organization, planning, technical

expertise, and so on. The EK students, for example, particularly the video group (the technical support group), were as involved in their production as any students could be in a learning-teaching experience, and no doubt learned a great deal from their experience. As is often the case with an educational experience, however, they may not have learned what the teachers intended them to learn.

Finally, we learned a great deal about what is involved in coordinating a project involving three classes and over one hundred students. In brief, we learned that it was possible, and that it was also both exciting and demanding in terms of how we planned the timing and orchestration of so many parts into a coherent whole.

Final Thoughts

In this film presentation project, students had the opportunity to select, analyze, and critique a film, using both the English language and a variety of visual media to "teach" what they had learned to other students. In spite of the project's rough edges, we believe that our students learned more about critical engagement with ideas and issues by working collaboratively toward this goal than if we had guided and controlled the project in more traditional, teacher-centered ways. In our case there were special advantages to using films for the project, not only to solve our structural problems during this particular semester. The films, unlike printed novels and stories, allowed students to enter quickly into an analytical and critical frame of mind. Students did not, in other words, need to spend the majority of the semester struggling with linguistic aspects of reading; instead, they spent their time on complex thinking and organizing tasks, and on the linguistic aspects of presenting their ideas orally to a real audience. Given the time, and fewer structural constraints, teachers and students can certainly craft the same kind of learning-by-teaching experience using media other than film, such as readings. The goal remains the same: to involve students in an intellectual and communicative activity that requires complex thinking, organizational and presentational skills, and language.

We remain committed to a learning-by-teaching approach that involves collaborative group work and presentation to real audiences, whether or not we need to solve a structural problem of large classes. We also remain committed to instructional activities that allow us to relinquish control of the specific ways students prepare their ideas while still providing them with ongoing guidance. We recognize that by giving up some teacherly control, by asking students to do their own preparation for teaching, what students learn cannot be predicted to the extent we may wish it to be. The benefits have to do primarily with increased learner autonomy and with the possibilities for providing students with chances for deep rather than passive engagement with tasks.

References

Allwright, D., & Bailey, K. M. (Eds.) (1991). *Focus on the classroom: an introduction to classroom research for language teachers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Arredondo, D. E., & Rucinski, T. T. (1994). Using the workshop approach in university classes to develop student metacognition. *Innovative Higher Education, 18*, 273-289.

Casanave, C. P. (1992). Educational goals in the foreign language class: The role of content-motivated journal writing. *SFC Journal of Language and Communication*, Vol. 1, 83-103.

Cohen, E. G. (1994). Restructuring the classroom: Conditions for productive small groups. *Review of Educational Research, 64*, 1-35.

Cohen, E. G. (1986). *Designing groupwork: Strategies for the heterogeneous classroom.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Deren, M. (1985). Cinematography: The creative use of reality. In G. Mast, & M. Cohen (Eds.), *Film theory and criticism* (third edition) (pp. 51-65). New York: Oxford University Press.

Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R. T. (1994). Cooperative learning in second language classes. *The Language Teacher 18 (10)*, 4-7.

Kember, D., & Gow, L. (1994). Orientations to teaching and their effect on the quality of students learning. *Journal of Higher Education, 65*, 58-74.

Kessler, C. (Ed.) (1992). *Cooperative language learning.* Englewoods Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Krashen, S. D. (1987). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall International.

Nunan, D. (Ed.) (1992). *Collaborative language learning and teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Slavin, R. (1983). *Cooperative learning.* New York: Longman.

Wedman, J. M., Hughes, J. A., & Robinson, R. R. (1993). The effect of using a systematic cooperative learning approach to help preservice teachers learn informal reading inventory procedures. *Innovative Higher Education, 17*, 231-241.

FINDING THE LAST PUZZLE PIECE THROUGH CONVERSION

Yoko Shimizu

When I was six years old, my family and I moved to the United States because of my father's job. I was educated there for 12 years until I came back to Japan. In Japan, I discovered the difficulty of the Japanese language. Not only were my *kanji* skills very poor, but I also realized that my Japanese skills overall needed a lot of work. In the beginning, I even had difficulty understanding lectures and seriously thought I might fail all of my courses taught in Japanese. I missed being able to speak English freely and to express my thoughts on paper without so much hesitation. To maintain (or possibly improve) my English skills and to regain confidence in myself, I decided to take English as my required language choice at Keio SFC. Therefore, in the Spring of 1993, I enrolled in the Intensive English Course for high level English students (mainly returnees) with TOEFL scores of 600 and above.

A Movie Is for Entertainment? My Original Thoughts about Film Viewing

"Wonderful! I'm going to watch films in my English class!" This was my first reaction when I discovered I would be watching films as a central part of class. Until then, I had only watched movies for entertainment, as I'm sure most people do. Cuddling together on a couch with my friends, I used to hold a big bucket of buttered popcorn and run the video that we had chosen according to its popularity and the number of "cool" actors and actresses that showed up in it. Once the video ran, it never stopped until the movie ended. I saw only the main story, the story that anyone could understand from just watching the film. For example, when I watched *Fried Green Tomatoes* for the first time, I understood it only as a story about an old woman in a hospital who tells a story about a friend she had when she was young, while a fat woman with an eating problem listens and learns to be strong. Because it never occurred to me that there might be another story in it, I didn't like the film very much.

Although I obviously didn't expect comfortable sofas nor buttered popcorn in the course, I did expect to have some fun, as in the fun that I often experience while watching videos with my friends, laughing about ridiculous jokes and accepting the story as it is. However, my expectations were not fulfilled. In the class, I was too busy writing notes to laugh at jokes. In the film course, the students were taught to look into the "other side of the story" and to watch films critically. With a pencil in one hand and a notebook in the other, we tried to look at everything the screen showed and wrote down anything that

we even slightly suspected was a symbol, a sign of foreshadowing, or anything that might be helpful for us to further understand the film, not just the main story. In the end, what we had in our notes gave us ideas about the theme of the film, the message of the film, or whatever came as the topic of the paper that we wrote after viewing each film.

Learning to Ask Questions!

Before taking this course, I often felt an indescribable feeling of dissatisfaction after watching films, as if something kept me from saying "Now that was a good movie!" Just as a puzzle is incomplete until the last piece is set, I felt as though I failed to place that last piece in the right place. It was in this film course that I found the answer why--I hadn't looked into the movie deep enough and was missing important points.

The first day the class watched the movie *Fried Green Tomatoes*, the instructor, as always, froze the scene at a very odd place--a scene showing a rusty old truck getting pulled out of muddy water--a scene I thought was almost meaningless to the story. Annoyed and frustrated that he wouldn't let the film get to it's main story, I waited for his explanation.

Pointing at the screen, he asked us "What do you think that means?" Confused, I asked myself, "I don't understand....what else is it but a dirty truck? So what if a truck was found in dirty water?" Since the teacher told us to write whatever we felt about the scene into our notes, I wrote down, "What is the significance of the truck? What is the significance of the filthy water?"

The instructor continued to press the pause button every time scenes changed or something he thought was important appeared in it, and told us to write down anything we felt or saw. When traintracks appeared on the screen, and he paused it again, and asked the class, "What did you see? Did something catch your attention? If so, write it down," I still didn't understand his intention. Instead of being interested, I became more confused. I had no idea what to write, but I decided to write what I could think up, so I jotted down, "What is the significance of the traintracks?" feeling "My gosh, what a boring thing to think about, let alone, write about." Not for even a second at that time did I ever think I'd be writing about it, and enjoying it.

The instructor not only constantly told us to write down what we thought, but he also often called on some of the students to tell him what they thought. In a scene where Mrs. Couch, the overweight woman with little confidence in herself, begins to show signs of self-confidence, he stopped the tape and called on me to explain what I thought about it, if I could relate Mrs. Couch's growth to someone else's in the film. For a minute, I looked through my notes and came up with an idea. "Could it be that Mrs. Couch's growth is

very similar to Idgie's?" I asked. As soon as I understood the point, I was able to present my opinion smoothly.

Once I realized how to answer questions that piled up in my notes, I eventually learned to find the scavenging for answers quite fun because of the satisfaction and the confidence I felt when I found them.

Oh, I Get It!

After watching the movie once, I was overwhelmed with questions, words, and phrases in my notebook, and as I looked at them, I realized I'd written the same words more than once. One such word was "train", and ironically, I felt attached to it because it appeared so many times in my notes and convinced me that there must be something important about it. Ultimately I chose to look further into the connection between the story and the train.

As soon as I decided what I wanted to further look into, I put together all of my notes on "train." When I came up with my list of where the train appeared and when, I began to see a pattern..... "Oh, I get it! The train passes by Whistlestop whenever Idgie experiences a change in her life, first when Buddy dies, next when she takes Ruth onto the train, and finally when Ruth dies." When Idgie loses her best friend, Buddy, in a railroad accident, she becomes even more withdrawn and selfish. When she and Ruth go on the train to distribute food to the poor, we see that she has become more caring for others and less self-centered. Finally, when Ruth, her best friend after Buddy's death, dies she learns to accept death, and to become an adult, a lady. Thus, I found my thesis: "The train takes Idgie from an immature tomboy to a grown-up adult."

This is why I now strongly feel that notetaking about even something one may think is just a minor aspect of the story, is important in finding one's strong thesis.

Finding Evidence to Convince the Readers

After I found my thesis, I needed to watch the video again to find a convincing argument to prove my idea was correct. Because I knew what scenes were crucial to my paper, I watched them with much attention. I compared Idgie's actions before each "train" incident with her actions after the scene, and checked that Idgie had matured, as I suspected she had. When I made sure my opinion was correct, I knew I could write an argument that was descriptive and convincing, and that even the strict instructor will enjoy reading my paper.

Because I knew exactly what I was to write, all I had to do was to type it out which

turned out to be quite simple. I had my thesis, my notes, and my main points straightened out, which were all I needed. As if I had already written my paper in my head, I wrote it without hesitation, which was unusual for me. Until then, I had sometimes found difficulty writing my papers. Often, I had stayed up all night to come up with something interesting and convincing, but in the end, I was left with a boring, meaningless paper. Now I realize that the reason for my continuous failure was my inability to come up with an interesting thesis, and to look deeper into my text which meant that I was trying to write papers with very little understanding about it.

Soon after I finished my paper the instructor called on my to present my idea, and I could explain my idea to the class with confidence. I learned how good it felt to be satisfied about my work, and to be able to present it, knowing that I had a strong argument.

Conversion: From Viewing Film as Entertainment to Viewing Film as Text

As a result of my taking this course, I learned a new way of watching films-- viewing film as a text. By having learned this method, I feel as though I have found the last puzzle piece. Because I changed from an indifferent viewer to a critical viewer, asking questions about an awkward scene or looking for signs that might give me a clue to an answer, I can now look forward to discovering something new everytime I see a film, more than just the main story. As "the train served as a symbol that alerted the viewer to Idgie's maturity," the film course itself served as a guide to my growth in understanding film watching.

My Improvement in English

As I stated above, I took Intensive English to gain confidence in myself and to improve my English skills. After one semester of the English Film Course, however, I realized I gained much more than that.

Now as a junior at the University, I can understand lectures with less difficulty and write papers that make sense. More important, however, is the fact that I learned much more than I expected from Intensive English. Not only did my English writing improve, but my ability to view films also improved, which I never expected from taking Intensive English. I feel as though I took a film course and an English course at once. I learned the techniques of film watching, constantly thinking about each scene of the film and about everything that appears in it, but I also discovered how to find my own idea about

the film, find my own thesis through my notes and through my thoughts about the film and to communicate these ideas in English. Although I knew how to find a thesis for a paper about a novel or about a poem, it never occurred to me that I could find my own idea in a movie. Before the course, I thought movies gave me all the information, that all I had to do was sit and watch. Now, I know differently.

THE VALUE OF READING AND FILM VIEWING IN FOSTERING CRITICAL THINKING

Sae Yamada

I am presently a junior who has just finished taking the advanced level English Intensive Course at Keio University's Shonan Fujisawa Campus (SFC). In all the three semesters of this course, the aim of the class was not to concentrate on grammar, spelling or vocabulary. We were required to think. Think intellectually and critically on issues or certain themes. To achieve this aim, films and readings were used in class as text materials. Throughout the three semesters with both readings and films, my mind developed much more when reading than film viewing. So did the process of critical thinking.

In the first semester, the class proceeded by first viewing films, then talking in general about the film we saw. Then we broke up into groups of five to six people. Here we exchanged ideas and sometimes read each other's response journals which we wrote almost every week. The class procedure was almost the same in the second semester. The difference was that instead of films, we did readings.

All films and readings we did in class dealt with certain themes. "Cross-cultural Conflict" was the theme for the first semester. In the second semester it was "Human Relationships." The materials used in providing the themes were films such as *Fried Green Tomatoes* (discrimination against women and between whites and blacks), *Do The Right Thing* (discriminaton among races in America such as blacks, Hispanic, Koreans and whites), *The Milagro Beanfield War* (discrimination between the Hispanics and the whites in America) and *Children of a Lesser God* (discrimination between the handicapped and non-handicapped). For the theme "Human Relationships", we watched *When Harry Met Sally* , a film about the relationships between men and women. We also read short stories written by a variety of authors from "A Family Supper" by Kazuo Ishiguro to "Two Kinds" by Amy Tan. We also had class presentations at the end of each semester. My class as a whole did *Children of A Lesser God* in the first semester as our final presentation. At the end of the second semester, my group did a presentation based on our analysis on the book, *Lord of The Flies* by William Golding.

As I worked throughout the semesters with films and readings, I felt my mind developed and grew a lot more when we read and not when we viewed films as materials for critical thinking. From this experience, I believe that critical thinking can be better achieved by reading than film viewing. The difference occurs for three reasons: the difference in intellectual engagement of the mind, the difference in imagination that is

required, and, most important, the difference in the interpretive process involved.

Intellectual Engagement

Viewing films does not require the full involvement of the intellectual mind. In other words, viewing films is usually a passive act. I do not mean that students just sitting and watching films in class is a passive act. Viewing films is passive because it does not require the full engagement of the brain. In other words, it undermines the necessity to understand what is going on in the film and has a tendency to divert the audience's attention from the real message or essence of the film.

In class, when viewing a film, most of us students just had to keep our eyes open but not the mind. To know what was going on, we just had to keep watching the film. Even if there were parts we did not understand, the film kept moving forward. So even if we did not get what was going on at that moment, it was still possible to keep up with the film because just watching it, we could guess what had happened. Seeing is believing; therefore, we just had to watch to follow. This could be a big help for some students who give up easily especially when dealing with something that is in English, which is their second language. On the other hand, this discourages the viewer from thinking actively on his/her own. For example, the film *Do The Right Thing* was a heavy film. I found it difficult to understand every scene and what the director, Spike Lee, was trying to convey to us. It was certainly difficult to keep my mind alert at all times but understanding every scene was not necessary. I could still take part in the discussion with my classmates.

Reading was a different matter. For example, "The Cat Bird Seat" by James Thurber took a lot of energy and I had to make use of all the knowledge I had. I had to read and reread the story several times to finally understand what the situation was and what was the context of the story. It was only then that I could participate fully in the discussion. For me, I was more prepared for the discussions after going through a reading in class than after watching a film. Discussion after watching the film helped me understand the film better but discussion after going through the written work, drove the discussion deeper in a more academic way. We became more aware of the themes and became more conscious of the theme itself.

I find that films do the thinking for us. The necessity of understanding the incidents is undermined by viewing films. If we get used to this, then when we do readings, just reading good books or good articles, becomes tough work. This might lead some students to laziness or tend to make their minds dull. From my experience with readings, I had to recognize words, sentences and details to get the picture. I needed the

participation of every cell in my brain to help me recognize these. Also there are parts or paragraphs in the readings which are important and need to be digested by the brain until the readers get the points. I had to go back and forth through the pages to understand those certain parts. Of course, we can watch films over and over again but it is not as convenient and easy to review films as it is to review the readings. Furthermore, we can go through the pages anytime, anywhere in our own free time, in trains or while waiting for the bus which is not possible with films.

Most films that succeed in capturing the audience's attention are films that are either fast moving, or that have scenes that are fascinating or otherwise amusing. Films tend to take the audience's attention away from important conversations or events that could otherwise engage us intelectually to scenes of violence or sex. Visual images have a more effective way of staying in our minds; therefore, rather than the important dialogue or message, these scenes are the ones which stay with us.

Imagination

One reason that I like reading is that it gives me a chance to develop my imagination. I believe imagination helps develop the reader's thinking skills. Imagining does not limit itself to what the characters look like, what kind of environment the characters live in or what kind of car they drive in the year 2599. Imagination goes beyond that. We can also imagine the characters' feelings, the pain, the joy, the hardship, and the jokes. At the same time, understanding why the characters feel the way they do is what I call imagination.

Most important, it is exciting to create the story (following the reading material of course) in my own way and my own style. Reading encourages and stimulates my imagination. As I read, the words turn to images. In "A Family Supper" by Kazuo Ishiguro, there is the line, "My father was a formidable-looking man with large stony jaw and furious black eyebrows." Imagine that. Imagine the "furious eyebrows." What you and I imagine can be completely different. This could lead to self discovery because we can compare what we imagined and understand more about ourselves. Haven't you ever felt disappointed after watching a favorite book made into a film? What you imagined was totally different and maybe sometimes it takes your hopes away.

When I imagined Simon with flies buzzing around his head and there was no way to get rid of them in *Lord of The Flies*, I believe the effect would be different when reading that page and when watching the film. I would think, "Uggh! Disgusting!" when viewing the film, but when reading, I would not be distracted by the ugly scene and will be able to concentrate on what is happening in the story and allow my imagination to run

on freely. Imagining the flies around Simon's head and my head would make me want to throw up but at the same time, I would be fascinated by what I imagined and how it would affect me. Here, I am able to put myself into Simon's shoes. I would be able to imagine what he is going through. What would I do in such a situation? And on my imagination goes. It would also be interesting to read the same page again sometime later and see if I still imagine things I did the last time.

Imagining the characters' feelings will shed some light not only on other people's behavior and attitudes but also on our own. Putting ourselves into other people's shoes and imagining what they are going through will help us understand people better. I am always confused when my friends talk or laugh or act in a way that I find disturbing, and not knowing why they act that way makes things worse for me. Or sometimes I just wonder why I find some people weird and strange yet I like them. Or why my parents are the way they are towards me. All these questions with no answers. The surprising thing is that sometimes I find the help or solutions in books. The details and the information written in the book give us the opportunity to go into another person's life and see things the way that person does. When the characters are in a similar situation as I am or as others are, I will be able to imagine other's feelings and apply my understanding to real life situations.

Interpretive Process

Viewing a film is watching someone else's work. Films such as *Fried Green Tomatoes* are based on a book. When the work of interpreting is done, and the film is made, we have a director's interpretation of the book. And when we view *Fried Green Tomatoes*, we are looking at one person's interpretation of the original work. There is not much critical thinking that can be done here because we students who watched *Fried Green Tomatoes* in class, did not read the original material. If we had read the original, we would have developed our own interpretation and understanding of the original piece. It would have prepared us because if we have the preknowledge of the material after reading, we can watch the film critically. We can compare our interpretation with the director's interpretation. This is more stimulating because we can actually compare what is different or new or the same. As both the audience and the director have read the original work, there is a standard base everyone can refer to. If we do not read the original and just watch the film, it is natural to feel bored and become passive. This attitude will of course, raise no intellectual doubts or questions in the minds of the audience.

Boredom and passivity will influence us to value the film as just a piece of

entertainment or another person's thoughts. Films are entertainment because they do not require much interpretation, allowing the audience to sit back and relax. It is through the director's thoughts or eyes that we see things. What the director wants us to see is what we see. It narrows our range of vision, as if to say, "This is what you see" for films. For readings, it is, "This is all there is, you figure out what to see and how to think about what you see." When we read, we, the students or readers, have to make our own interpretation of the reading, whereas the interpretation is already done in films. The mind involvement required is very small, and amounts just to following the development of the story. Forget the reality and enjoy the film because film is a world of dreams. We do not need to bother with the fact that the themes brought up in those films deal with sensitive issues such as cross-cultural conflict and discrimination.

I believe interpretation is the key that opens the story to us. When I do my own interpretation, first of all I have to understand the vocabulary, the words used, and at the same time, why the author wrote the book. As I read and understand the story, I feel closer to the characters. I also develop a sympathy towards these characters and can understand why they take such actions towards problems and conflicts in the way the story develops. I do not, however, feel close to whatever happens in the film. The themes "Cross-cultural Conflict" and "Human Relationships" are something I face in my daily life with friends, family and people. So when I watch films that deal with these themes, I should be able to identify with the events and feelings in the film. Somehow to my discovery, I felt closer to the characters and seem to understand the meaning of the context better when I read. It is as if the films and I are too far apart, perhaps because I do not need to interpret much here. I cannot connect the issues in the film to my life without feeling forced to do so. *Do The Right Thing* felt so far away, as if what happened was none of my business. When I read "Ten to Ten" by Can Themba or "Like a Winding Sheet" by Ann Petry, I felt closer to the story and felt the progress of the story stronger. For example, as I was reading "Like a Winding Sheet" I could feel the tension building up between the husband and the wife and the whole atmosphere that surrounded the husband as I struggled to understand the story. When the tension erupted (the main character, Joe, loses control of his temper after a long hard day), I could feel the tension coming and could sympathize along with Joe and his wife. I unconsciously entered into the story and entered Joe's mind. In *Do The Right Thing* the film had it's own way of building up the tension. I could tell that the tension was about to erupt and where and what the climax would be but I did not feel it as strongly as when reading "Like a Winding Sheet."

The time and effort taken for interpretation varies depending on the reader or the students. Often the work of interpretation takes up too much time. As students, we

know that class time is very limited. We prefer not to spend too much time on one thing. It is true that reading is time consuming but I find this not a good enough reason for using films rather than readings. Films such as *Fried Green Tomatoes* can be watched elsewhere. Although readings can also be done elsewhere, I needed the help of the English instructor just to explain some points that needed to be straightened out before any discussion could occur. Rather than using an hour and a half or more time for a film in class, it is better to spend the class time going over the book.

This also affects the intructor's way of teaching. If films are used in class, the instructor need not explain or help the students with any interpretation at all. I always seek the help of my instructors mostly when writing essays, and at other times, when I cannot understand the context of the readings and therefore am unable to do my own interpretation.

Conclusion

Reading develops our minds not only in the sense that we train ourselves to think critically but it also helps us grow in other beneficial ways. We can improve our language and enrich our writing expressions.

At SFC, where critical thinking is what we are expected to do, we (my classmates and I) had a lot of discussions in class. Here we voiced our opinions and thoughts. Everyone can do this. It is easy to talk, to express one own's thoughts to others. When it comes to writing, it is not as simple as talking. In writing it is important to be able to express thoughts effectively with concrete reasons to the other person. In class, if asked to voice out their opinions, everyone will do so. But when it came to writing, not many participated. I was the editor for a collection of essays for our class. I found out that most of us did not know how to write and including myself, we did not have enough writing practice to write an essay we could be proud of. There exists a big handicap when trying to express feelings in words. Using words to express what we saw, felt, and wanted to say was hard work because we did not learn any of these, at least in class when watching films. It is important to know how to explain the complex situation and human feelings in written language, and reading can help us do this.

Readings are souvenirs of our thoughts. After reading or viewing films, after discussion or after thinking about what we have just read or watched, sometimes our minds change or the way we think changes. Right after watching *Do The Right Thing*, I was confused and disturbed by the film, because although I knew the story, I did not understand it. After discussion, I finally got some ideas and so the way I saw the film has changed. But this is only a reward of knowing that I finally understood what the

director saw and not the real issue being discussed. Also, it is easy to miss out important details in films (with the violence and sex distractions). With readings, we can underline sentences, make marks, and go back afterwards. We cannot make marks in a film. There is the possibility to take notes during film viewing but while taking notes, we could miss tiny, important details that occur as we are writing.

Where critical thinking is concerned, I believe reading rather than viewing films achieves this better. Reading keeps the intellectual mind alert and awake at all times, develops our imagination, and most important of all, allows us to construct our own interpretations.

THE LISTENING-VIEWING DIARY IN AN ADVANCED LISTENING/SPEAKING CLASS

Naomi K. Fujishima

In an EFL environment, it is often difficult to find materials which give students exposure to English as it is spoken by native English speakers as well as exposure to Western culture. Listening to taped lectures, songs, and radio programs are some examples of ways to develop skills in listening and speaking, but video is another more powerful medium as it offers both audio and visual cues to the language learner. With video, students not only can learn about language, but also how it is used in the target culture. Because of the many advantages that video offers, there has been a growing amount of video materials available to teachers and students.

Basically, videos can be divided into two categories--video material designed for English language teaching (ELT), and non-ELT material (Allan, 1985). Videos designed for ELT have the advantage of offering graded language use and providing exercise materials to aid the students and teacher. On the other hand, non-ELT material, or authentic material, is geared toward native speakers and, thus, does not provide graded language use. For the second language learner, authentic video allows the student to see how native speakers interact in either staged or natural settings of real-life situations. In EFL situations, finding opportunities outside of class to listen to native speakers can be a difficult task. For that reason, movie videos can give the students this opportunity. I base my own choice to use authentic video in the language classroom on these four tenets, following Stempleski (1994):

1) It presents real language.
2) It provides an authentic look at the culture.
3) It gives students practice in dealing with the medium.
4) It motivates learners.

Because the teacher must compile and choose authentic materials from a number of sources, classroom preparation can sometimes be rather time-consuming. However, the advantages far outweigh the disadvantages when the teacher can see the interest authentic video sparks in the students. In addition, for many students, video viewing is an entertaining and enjoyable experience.

In Kwansei Gakuin University's Intensive English Program (IEP), movie videos were used as one assignment, designed with the above points in mind, to provide students with a project they could enjoy doing, while at the same time presenting them with realistic examples of language and culture. The assignment was called the Listening-

Viewing (LV) Diary.

The idea of the LV Diary was adapted from an article written by Michael Furmanovsky called "The Listening-Viewing Video Diary: Doubling Your Students' Exposure to English" (Furmanovsky, 1994). Furmanovsky describes how, after reading through numerous student diaries, he designed an elaborate notetaking form where students could systematically jot down notes regarding both cultural and language aspects of the movie they watch. Students were to choose three or more language aspects and two visual or cultural observations from one scene and take notes. He also gave his students the freedom to choose a movie of their liking. At the end of the term, he assessed students by either asking them to give a 5-6 minute presentation or conducting what he called "rotating pair dialogs" where "students questioned each other about their diaries for 6-8 minutes before moving on to another student" (p. 49).

According to the article, Furmanovsky's main purpose for this activity was to give students more exposure to spoken English and to non-Japanese cultures. Although Kwansei Gakuin's IEP allowed students more exposure to native English than other regular track, non-IEP classes, I felt that two 90-minute classes a week still wasn't enough. Based on Furmanovksy's appraisal of the LV Diary that students' exposure to "native spoken English...can easily be doubled" (p. 26), I decided to use it with my Advanced Listening and Speaking class.

The Setting, The Students, and The LV Diary Assignment

At Kwansei Gakuin, the LV Diary was used as a homework project for students taking an Advanced Listening and Speaking Course to give them exposure to both the cultural and sociolinguistic aspects of the English language. The class met twice a week for 90-minute periods, and was made up of approximately 28 students from various departments such as Law, Science, Sociology, Humanities, Economics, and Business. The course was an elective, so students who first passed a screening test signed up voluntarily to take it. The textbook for the class was called *Passages: Exploring Spoken English* (James, 1993), for high-intermediate learners. The LV Diary was used as an additional assignment and was not related to any topics referred to in the textbook. Since the class was made up of students from various disciplines, the LV Diary was assigned as a way for them to focus on something that everyone had in common, that is, watching movies.

Many of the steps in Furmanovsky's article were used in the Kwansei Gakuin assignment; however some adjustments were made. For example, the notetaking form was simplified and only required the students to choose one language aspect and one

visual or cultural observation (see Appendix A). In addition, each scene the students were to watch could only be 3-5 minutes in length. This was included because, at the beginning, some students tried to watch a whole 20-minute segment of the movie and had a hard time focusing. With short segments, it was easier for the students to concentrate on one or two aspects and analyze them critically. After the students took notes, they were to write a 100-200 word essay which included these points:

1) their viewing technique (students had the option of watching the movie in its entirety before or after their analysis)
2) a summary of the content of the scene
3) why they chose this particular scene (what cultural or language aspect interested them the most)

At the beginning of the semester, I took an informal poll to see which movies students thought were popular. From the results of the poll, I selected three movies that students were to base their LV Diaries on. Each student chose one of the three movies to focus on throughout the semester.

Since this assignment was a rather new concept for the students, it took some time to explain the notetaking form and how to use it. I chose a short, one-and-a-half-minute scene from *Lethal Weapon* for students to practice with during class. The scene was somewhat simple--Detective Murtaugh, played by Danny Glover, walks into the kitchen in the morning and is greeted by his wife. He has a brief conversation with her, gulps down some orange juice and gets ready to dash off to work. As he leaves the kitchen, his young daughter complains to him about her brother. He gives her a kiss, pats her on the head, and is about to leave when his teenage daughter appears in a sexy party dress to ask for his approval. A look of shock is on his face as he realizes uneasily that his little girl is growing up. His facial expression is that of anxiety and worry as he goes out the door.

First, I explained each point carefully in the note-taking sheet. I emphasized the fact that even though they were only watching one-and-a-half-minutes of a movie, there were many language and visual cues to work from. Even though students were to do this assignment individually outside of class, I had them work in groups during class to help each other look for the cultural or language aspects. I didn't use a closed-captioned version because none was available, but I was hoping the students would try to look for visual cues rather than specific language observations. However, my expectations were perhaps too high, and students were confused as to what they were supposed to do. Since I only gave them two or three chances to watch the segment, they didn't have enough time to absorb the information. I emphasized the fact that at home, students could watch the segment they chose as many times as they wanted to find their observations.

In this particular scene from *Lethal Weapon*, I wanted students to notice the close relationship between the daughters and their father, and how openly affectionate the father

was. Of course, not all fathers are this way, but in general, in the U.S., it is socially acceptable for middle-class parents to show affection to their children. On the other hand, in Japan, people are usually more reserved and do not show affection so openly. After I explained this comparison, we watched the scene again, and the students tried once more. I stressed that it was not so important to understand what was actually said, but how the participants spoke and reacted to each other, such as intonation and facial expressions. I also reminded them to look at the surrounding elements of the scene, such as the layout of the house or the clothing being worn. In the end, some were even able to catch a few phrases which I put up on the board afterwards and explained in detail.

After going through this introduction exercise, the students were to do the LV Diary on their own time outside of class and turn in five entries all together in one semester. The three movies they could choose from were *Pretty Woman*, *Dead Poets Society*, and *Roman Holiday*. Each student looked at one movie and chose five different scenes on their own to analyze. I made sure the students knew that I would be available to help them if there were any areas they couldn't understand. At the end of the semester, the students, either alone or in pairs, presented a language or cultural observation which they taught to the rest of the class (see Appendix B for explanation of this assignment). Class time was allotted for the students to work in movie groups, so they could all choose different scenes to present.

As an example, one group of students taught the class the phrase "Seize the day!" from *Dead Poets Society* (#1 in the Looking at Language section of the notetaking form-Appendix A). At first, they showed the scene where it was uttered by the English teacher, Mr. Keating, played by Robin Williams. Then, they asked the audience if anyone could understand what was said. After choosing one or students to guess, they wrote the phrase on the board and explained the meaning. In this particular scene, Mr. Keating tells his students that every living being ends up as "food for worms". To make the boys' lives worthwhile, he says they must "seize the day, make your life extraordinary." The group ended their presentation on a positive note, saying that they were influenced greatly by this particular phrase.

The Problems

One of the purposes of this assignment was to give students exposure to slices of Western culture by using movies they were interested in and to give them another assignment different from the textbook. Many students expressed enthusiasm for movies and wanted to know what the actors and actresses were saying in their favorite scenes. What better way to satisfy their curiosity than by using the LV Diary? Students could see

and hear authentic language in context as well as learn about other features such as facial expressions, gestures, formal and informal settings, and social and economic status. However, after giving this assignment once, I found there were some considerations to keep in mind for future assignments.

Although one purpose was to give students exposure to western cultures, I also wanted students to focus on various language aspects of the films. The first problem I noticed was that students sometimes had trouble using new vocabulary words correctly in a new sentence or really understanding new expressions or idioms. If students were able to use what they heard by making up an original sentence with the new vocabulary word, it was an indication that they understood the meaning. On the notetaking form, there were spaces to write in the meaning and make up a new sentence (for the new vocabulary word). Sometimes, the spaces were left blank or the meanings did not match the context in which the word or expression was used in the scene. Some students did check the meaning with me or other native speakers, but it was difficult to monitor all the students. In a class with fewer students, this task would have been easier to carry out. An example of a section of the filled out notetaking form is in Appendix A.

Another difficulty for some students was the diary entry. Some students wrote one or two sentences only, or made a list of items that they thought would fulfill the writing requirement. Explanation about how to write journals in English was not specifically addressed in class because the assumption was that since this was an advanced listening and speaking course, the students would have had exposure to journal writing in previous classes.

One more problem involved the final oral presentation. Some students lacked the necessary skills for effective public speaking, such as speech organization, timing, eye contact, loudness, posture, etc. Students need to practice these skills more and be better prepared for this final assignment.

Finally, I found that some students were not used to the notion of watching a movie actively, where they must participate in the viewing and learning process. As Lonergan (1984) states, "It is essential....that learners are introduced gradually to video in the classroom, and guided to an understanding of how valuable the medium can be" (p. 6). In some diary entries, students wrote comments such as "I enjoyed watching this movie" or "Audrey Hepburn is pretty, so I chose this movie." I appreciated their honest opinion, but felt they could have delved deeper in their analysis of the scene they chose.

The Benefits

In spite of the problems I encountered with this assignment, I still feel it is a

worthwhile activity to use in the language classroom. Even with the lack of journal writing and oral presentation skills, students were challenged by the LV Diary to take an active role in the viewing process. At the same time, they were given the freedom to choose scenes and movies they liked. Since the students worked on several diary entries throughout the semester, they were able to grow more analytical and improve each entry as time went on.

Several students commented that although the assignment was time-consuming, it helped them learn new expressions and vocabulary words, as well as learn about different American customs. In the diary entry, some students asked me questions about specific points in the scenes they viewed. For example, one student asked about a scene in *Pretty Woman* where Edward, played by Richard Gere, takes Vivian, played by Julia Roberts, to a formal business dinner. The student wondered if it was usual for an American businessman to take his girlfriend or wife to a business meeting. I learned that, in Japan, it is rare for a businessman (or woman, for that matter) to bring along his (her) spouse or companion to a company dinner or party. In another scene from the same movie, another student found it strange that Vivian took a bubble bath. In Japan, people do not usually put bubbles in their baths.

Another positive outcome of the cumulative diary entries was the final assignment. As mentioned earlier, at the end of the semester, students gave oral presentations, either alone or in pairs, on one language or cultural observation which they chose from their LV Diaries. The presentations were a good way for the students to analyze thoroughly the language or cultural aspect they presented, as well as to learn about other language points or cultural differences from their classmates. At the end of the term, many students commented that even though the presentations were stressful, they were glad they did it because they could learn new expressions and note cultural differences from their peers.

Conclusion

Furmanovsky (1994) neglects to mention in his article the learning level of his students, making it difficult to determine the audience for this LV Diary project. He states that they were "second-year university students," but levels can vary from one university to another, indeed, from one school department to another. This was especially true in my Advanced Listening and Speaking class at Kwansei Gakuin with students from six different departments with ages ranging from 19-22. In a different setting, for example with a more homogeneous group, this activity might have been more successful.

In addition, Furmanovsky states that the ideal size of a class to assign the LV Diary is 20 and under. With a smaller class, the teacher can focus on more specific problems and

communicate better with each student. I became keenly aware of the communication problem between student and teacher with my class of 28. Perhaps choosing one movie for larger classes would help alleviate this problem for the teacher. With one movie, the teacher could have groups of students working on specific scenes together and any questions that arise could be shared with the whole class.

In the future, I will spend more time explaining and introducing this activity step-by-step. I now know the potential limitations of the students, and the extent of their own ability to choose and evaluate their observations. However difficult this LV Diary may seem, it is still a practical way for students to be exposed to native language use and to other cultures outside of the EFL classroom.

References

Allan, M. (1985). *Teaching English with Video.* Essex, England: Longman Group Limited.

Furmanovsky, M. (1994). The listening-viewing video diary: doubling your students' exposure to English. *The Language Teacher*, 18 (4), 26-28.

James, G. (1993). *Passages: Exploring Spoken English.* Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Lonergan, J. (1984). *Video in language teaching.* .Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Stempleski, S. (1994). Teaching Communication Skills With Authentic Video. In S. Stempleski & P. Arcario (Eds.). *Video in second language Ttaching: Using, selecting, and producing Vvdeo for the classroom* (pp. 7-24). Alexandria, VA: TESOL, Inc.

Appendix A

LISTENING-VIEWING DIARY *(with example)*

scene length: _____ minutes

Name: _____ Dept: _____

Movie Title:	*Date:* *Diary Number:*
Looking at Language (Choose 1 or more)	
1) Expression or Idioms Situation: Speakers: Meaning:	
2) Slang Situation: Speakers: Meaning:	
3) New vocabulary Situation: **boys in the study group are talking about Knox's dinner at the Danberrys** Speakers: **Knox and other boys** Meaning: **a terrible or unhappy event**	**tragedy** New Sentence: **The 1989 earthquake in California was a great tragedy.**
4) Pronunciation Situation: Speakers: How is it different?	

C5

5) Function (greetings, apologies, compliments, excuses, etc.)	
6) Other notable aspects CHALLENGE YOURSELF!	
Visual or cultural observations (Choose 1)	
1) Facial expressions and body language	
2) Cultural differences -- U.S. and Japan	
3) Interesting or unexpected translations	
4) Other notable aspects CHALLENGE YOURSELF!	

NOTE: ***On the back of this page, please <u>write a 100-200 word diary entry</u> of your analysis (See details on other side)***

TRY TO COVER THESE POINTS IN YOUR DIARY ENTRY (Of course, you may add more, if you like!):

- *your viewing technique*
- *a summary of the content of the scene*
- *why you chose this particular scene (what cultural or language aspect interested you the most?)*

Appendix B

LISTENING-VIEWING DIARY
ORAL PRESENTATION ASSIGNMENT

The final presentation for this class will be based on the Listening-Viewing Diaries you have compiled throughout the semester. You may work in pairs or individually on your scenes.

1) Find a scene that is interesting to you and has some language or cultural aspect which you can teach to the rest of the class.

2) Show the scene to the class. *(Naomi will provide the videotape, so let her know where the scene is -- give the time count)*

3) Explain the expression or gesture to the class. First, ask the class what they think it means, then give your interpretation. You may use the blackboard or OHP, if you like *(let Naomi know ahead of time if you need the OHP)*.

4) Explain the differences between the U.S. and Japan.

5) Give examples, so everyone understands clearly. If you are presenting with a partner, a role play will enhance the presentation.

6) Your presentation will take about 15 minutes.

7) The presentations will be scheduled for **6/22** (Wed), **6/27** (Mon), and **6/29** (Wed). A sign-up sheet will be available soon.

BE SURE TO REMEMBER THESE POINTS:

- Look at your audience
- Do not read from a script
- Organize your presentation so it's easy to follow
- Speak loudly and clearly so people in the back can hear you
- Don't be nervous!

THE PORTRAYAL OF WOMEN IN AMERICAN FILMS: A SCENARIO FOR MISUNDERSTANDING

Yoshiko Takahashi[1]

From the mid-1960s to the end of the 1970s, two main cycles of films have dominated commercial films in Hollywood as a result of the women's movement (Kaplan 1983). In the first cycle, Hollywood followed a policy of total avoidance. It ignored issues associated with gender differences and excluded women from films almost entirely, focusing instead on films of male bonding. In the second cycle, a new trend emerged as Hollywood evidently came to believe the issues dealing with gender differences could no longer be avoided. Women came to be targets of violence. In *A Clockwork Orange* and *Last Tango in Paris*, women are brutally abused and raped. Kaplan (1983) explains this phenomenon as society's reaction to the women's movement. Male-dominant American society, says Kaplan, feels a serious threat from the women's movement, and women have to be put down in films.

In the 1980s, as American society had become more tolerant of women's battle for independence, for the first time mainstream commercial films started being made which explicitly address the social, political, and economic issues raised by the women's movement. *Looking for Mr. Goodbar*, made in 1977, may be the epitome of films in this genre. Theresa is among the first female characters to break the traditional female image in Hollywood films. She is attractive, but not a pretty doll; she is aggressive and often angry; she has explicitly depicted sexual desires. However, my experience with this film in the Japanese context suggests that the message of women's independence does not necessarily come through in the way(s) that the filmmaker may have intended.

In the fall semester of 1994, while I was teaching a seminar on feminism, I decided to use the film *Looking for Mr. Goodbar* as a text. My original idea in showing this film was to make my seminar students aware of the problems concerned with a woman's attempt to achieve independence. At the same time, I was hoping that the students would realize how a society, at least American society in 1977, was structured in such as way as to hinder women's liberation.

Student reaction, however, was contrary to my expectations. Their comments centered on the main character, a woman whom they described as displaying "aggressive behavior." It became immediately obvious that I was dealing with an "outculture" film (films made in or depicting other cultures) in hopes of engendering content discussions in the language

[1] I would like to thank my friends and colleagues for their patience in discussing, reading and editing this paper. I would especially like to thank Alan McCornick for his excellent editing and David Freedman for his insightful comments. I am also grateful to Christine Casanave and J. David Simons for their superb editorial comments.

classroom. I would like here to reflect on two aspects of this learning experience: the implicit cultural messages which undercut my intended political goals, and the subtextual semiotics in the film structure itself that undercut its purported feminist message. I will examine three additional films in addition to *Looking for Mr. Goodbar* that are generally familiar to audiences in the United States and Japan. These films are *Thelma and Louise* (1991), *Switch* (1991) and *Working Girl* (1988).

Looking for Mr. Goodbar

Looking for Mr. Goodbar purports to address explicitly the social, political, and economic issues raised by the women's movement of the 1970s. These issues, while quite familiar to American audiences of the time, were still hard for my Japanese students in 1994 to grasp. *Looking for Mr. Goodbar* deals fundamentally with issues of women's independence in a patriarchal society. Theresa, the main character, is a teacher of deaf-mute students. She leaves home to free herself physically and psychologically from her father, a tyrannical patriarch. Theresa rejects all the roles and values of this man, as well as the man he wants her to marry. The film follows her as she searches instead for men in singles bars. In the end, she is stabbed and killed by one of her one-night stands.

The film fails to reach Japanese students because the basic premise of the film, Theresa's need to escape oppression, is not evident to them. What is she running from, they wonder. To explain her behavior, two pieces of cultural information are necessary. The first is the power of religion in Western society. The power of religion is not perceived by the majority of polytheistic Japanese. The authority of the church which underlies the message of Theresa's father--that a woman's happiness can come only through marriage and child-bearing--does not communicate to the Japanese viewers the meaning that Catholic dogma carries to Western audiences. Unless a student can be made to feel the oppressiveness of religion embedded in Theresa's psyche, her struggle for liberation from its unconscious influence remains unsympathetic.

The second piece of cultural information is the power of the father in a patriarchal society. It is often said that the power of the Japanese father ended with defeat of the Japanese in World War II. Contemporary Japan is distinguished from other Asian cultures by its lessening of a son-fixated tradition. Girl babies increasingly tend to be as welcome as baby boys in contemporary Japanese families. The social and domestic climate which in the past made baby boys more attractive than baby girls has been quickly changing in Japanese society. Socially speaking, the feudalistic *ie* ("family") system which prescribed that only the eldest son could inherit the family name and the family fortune has almost ceased to exist in Japan. In the past, families without a son had to adopt a boy or a man to maintain the family

line. Discontinuation of the *ie* in one's generation was considered to be a shame and a betrayal to the family's ancestors. Since World War II all children regardless of their gender and the order of their birth are treated equally before the law. This change lifted social pressure on families to have male children.

From a domestic point of view, daughters are considered to be more useful than sons to parents. When daughters are small, they tend to stay psychologically and physically close to their parents. Even after marriage daughters tend to keep close contact with their parents. Many people say that when sons marry, you lose them and when daughters marry, you gain sons. What this means is, at least among middle-class families, married sons visit their wives' families equally or more often than their own families due to strong psychological bonds between daughters and mothers. Daughters can expect financial and physical support from their own mothers, and mothers and fathers in return expect to be cared for by their own daughters in old age.

Feminist activists in *Looking for Fumiko* (1993), a film documenting Japanese women's liberation movements in the 1970s, explained that at least at home Japanese women remain the center of the household and had power in the domestic sphere. The activists in the film claimed that Japanese women had control over their husbands, children's education and household budget. This domestic power made Japanese women less sympathetic to the international women's liberation movement. Lacking general support, women's liberation movements in Japan failed to attract many followers. I recognize that there is still broader scalle sexual discrimination against women in Japan. However, for students whose experiences are limited to mainly domestic spheres (where mothers are the center), it is very hard to understand the experience of a working class family like Theresa's, ruled by a parochial authoritarian male.

As I worked with students, encouraging them to examine the issues cross-culturally, instead of judging Theresa's behavior in terms of their personal values, I began to realize problems in the film itself. The further the class moved into the film, the closer we came not to the feminist struggle, but to a Hollywood notion of gender roles. On the surface, Theresa appears to be struggling for liberation. But there is an insidious subtext of visual clues and verbal hints to suggest a different message. In the daytime, Theresa is a compassionate and capable teacher of deaf-mute students. At night, however, she becomes a promiscuous woman in search of pleasure. The image strikes one as schizophrenic. The sacred mother during the day becomes the nymphomaniac at night, the bad girl deserving of punishment and banishment.

Theresa seems to be enjoying herself. But as the camera captures the filth in her kitchen we become aware of her constant restlessness, her insecurity, and her complete failure to achieve independence. We are left with the implication that there is no place in this world for

a woman like Theresa, and no fate for a woman who rejects a man's protection but death.

As I stated earlier, Japanese students failed to capture the basic premise of this film. They could not understand Theresa's need to escape from oppression. The power of religion and patriarchal oppression was alien to Japanese students. Theresa's struggle was perceived as too radical and violent by them. In addition to the lack of cultural information, however, I found more serious problems in the film itself. That is, superficially the film showed a feminist struggle, but closer examination of the film reveals that it conveys a different message (perhaps, a traditional Hollywood notion of gender roles). The visual cues of Theresa's dirty kitchen and her promiscuous behavior in the evening certainly confused Japanese students' attempts to justify Theresa's rebellious behavior, and therefore, the message of the film itself.

Thelma and Louise

Made in 1991, *Thelma and Louise* deals on the surface with the same theme as *Looking for Mr. Goodbar*, the price a woman has to pay for being on her own. In *Thelma and Louise*, two working-class women, a housewife and a waitress, set forth on a short summer trip. Before long they are involved in a series of serious difficulties. They stop off at a shabby roadside bar and Thelma, who is married to a despotic self-important man who shows little interest in her, fires herself up with margaritas and flirts with one of the roadside cowboys. The flirtation ends in an attempt at rape, but the rape is thwarted by Louise, who has a gun. The murder of the would-be rapist sets them off on their fatal journey.

In their flight from the police, they are verbally abused by a truck-driver, are robbed, and end up robbing a general store themselves. There is no turning back now and they become the target of a police search. No one, Thelma's husband included, makes any attempt to understand what is happening to the two women and in the end, they choose death rather than surrender to the forces about to engulf them.

I showed *Thelma and Louise* to a group of Japanese students in a summer program in the United States with the expressed purpose of generating discussion on gender issues. Once again, I found their understanding to flounder on two points. Why, they wondered, did Thelma and Louise have to go to such extremes of revolt? And why was Thelma so afraid of her husband?

Accustomed to a society where the value of harmony deflates the inclination to protest, the students find Thelma and Louise's choices incomprehensible. When faced with a social injustice, Japanese are likely to step back and ponder. What went wrong? Who is responsible? But to take action, to show oneself in a disturbed state of mind, has always been considered ignoble. Problems are to be solved or suffered quietly, at the personal level.

Indeed, the attitude is still common that society is bettered through self-improvement. This was the conclusion reached in the Japanese feminist movement of the 1970s and documented in the film *Looking for Fumiko* (1993). The women who participated in the movement came to the conclusion that they should improve themselves and not revolt. Given this background, it is not surprising that Thelma and Louise's violent and reckless actions should carry little sympathy with Japanese audiences.

In *Thelma and Louise*, Thelma's suffering originates in her husband's oppression. Too scared to face him, Thelma has to leave him a note to tell him she is leaving for a short summer trip with Louise. Thelma's relationship with her husband parallels the relationship between Theresa and her father in *Looking for Mr. Goodbar*. The characters of the father and the husband represent the controlling power in a patriarchal society.

Louise's anger and frustration come in part from her relationship with her boyfriend, a musician unwilling to commit to settling down. Unable to achieve the marriage she seeks, the institution which society teaches her is necessary for her satisfaction, she lives in a relationship characterized by tension. Both Thelma's anger and Louise's frustration reflect the tension of relationships.

Japanese young people's relationships develop in a considerably different context. Students, especially those from affluent middle class families, are seldom exposed to the threat of a father's male power. They are not controlled by their professional salary-man fathers in the same way as the characters of Theresa and Thelma and Louise are controlled by their male authority figures. Instead, unmarried girls often have controlling power over their fathers and boyfriends. The fact that Japanese girls often have a number of boyfriends for different purposes may support my assumption. For example, boys are labelled *asshii-kun* (from "ashi" - leg - in Japanese) if they are seen for their ability to provide girls with a ride in a car. Or they are *mitsugu-kun* (from "mitsugu" - contribute, or supply) if they are good providers of gifts.

The visual clues in *Thelma and Louise*, like those in *Looking for Mr. Goodbar*, carry different meanings for Japanese students from perhaps those intended by the filmmakers. In one scene, a police detective investigating Louise's house, finds her kitchen shining clean, and he concludes Louise cannot be the loose woman she is purported to be. He sympathizes with her and offers her help. Louise's personality and values are suggested by her clothing and her hairdo. Originally buttoned up and tidy, her clothes and hair gradually loosen as she approaches the fall. What is this "looseness"? Increasing freedom or the road to destruction? Japanese students tend to interpret these clues as a sign of Louise's fall from grace.

In addition to the two films I have discussed in the previous section, I would like to talk about two more films which are commonly used by colleagues to effectively foster discussion on gender issues in language classes. They are *Switch* (1991) and *Working Girl*

(1988). In contrast to *Looking for Mr. Goodbar* and *Thelma and Louise*, these films appear to carry little misleading cultural information. However, if we simply view these films as a means of approaching women's issues, we are still apt to find ourselves outwitted by student expectations. Students may actually draw the opposite "lessons" from those intended.

Switch

Switch (1991) serves to illustrate how verbal and nonverbal behavior are gender specific. In this film, Steve, a male chauvinist and exploiter of many women, is finally killed by one and condemned to hell. At the last minute, God gives him one chance to escape his destiny. If Steve can find a woman who truly loves him, God challenges him, he will be allowed into Heaven. He is sent back to Earth to complete his mission. It turns out the job is not as easy as Steve thinks. God has turned him into a woman.

Steve, now called Amanda, encounters all the usual women's difficulties in learning to be a stereotypical woman. The tight clothes, high heels, the long hair all restrict movement. Amanda cannot cross her legs, talk loud, or be vulgar. She learns to feel like a piece of meat. Only when she gives birth to a baby girl, at the last moment of her life as a woman, does she stop loathing being a woman. Up till that point, the film is a satire on gender polarization and the unfair treatment of women. Suddenly, the message becomes the lesson that a woman's hardships can all make sense, that life with difficulty can pay off, through childbirth! Students who were laughing loudly up till that last moment at the stupidity of gender polarization usually become serious at this point in the film. At that point, instead of analyzing the meaning and the validity of the lesson that the film is trying to teach, students start entertaining the idea that, after all, childbirth does justify a woman's existence.

Working Girl

Working Girl (1988) serves to illustrate class distinctions within gender. Tess, the main character of the film, is a secretary in a merger and acquisition company. She works for a female boss about her own age but different in every other way. Unlike Tess, the boss is poised, confident and capable. She dresses conservatively and speaks in a low well-modulated voice, in striking contrast to Tess's cute-little-girl character with make-up and hairdo fashioned to make her look like "just a secretary."

Tess is not just a secretary, however. She has ambition and a talent for business. She discovers that her boss has stolen her business ideas, outwits her and eventually wins over both her business and her business partner/boyfriend. The structure of *Working Girl* is similar to that of the previous films. There is a woman in need of help, and men capable of

helping. This time, however, the woman accepts. She also succeeds in a big way. And she gets it all. The students' interpretation of this film is usually simplistic. That is, a woman with a wicked mind is punished and a woman with a good heart succeeds. Students rarely reach the level of analysis where a stereotypical structure between men and women surfaces: men are the ones who have the power and resources and women are the powerless and resourceless ones. The stereotype persists that, without men's assistance and protection, women never succeed.

Discussion

I have identified two potential sources of problems in the use of "outculture" films in EFL programs. These are implicit cultural sources of power and authority and the subtextual semiotics in the film structure itself which undercut the purported message of feminism. In *Looking for Mr. Goodbar* and *Thelma and Louise*, without proper cultural guidance, Japanese students fail to understand the motivation for Theresa's rebellious behavior and for Thelma and Louise's rampage. In *Switch* and *Working Girl*, the stories and characters are less difficult to follow, but the treatment of the battle between the sexes, the hierarchy between men and women, the struggle between the powerful and the powerless still escapes them. If these Hollywood films are to be taken seriously, one would have to conclude this hierarchical structure has not changed since Adam was given Eve to be his companion and assistant. The cultural problems can be seen in two contrasting views of Japanese women--one is espoused in the work of Jane Condon (1985) and the other in the work of Sumiko Iwao (1993). The former portrays Japanese women as being seriously oppressed and the latter describes at least middle class women as being autonomous and unoppressed. If my assumption is correct, and Iwao has the better understanding, her view should help explain the Japanese students' perceptual gap.

Among the four films discussed, only *Looking for Mr. Goodbar* and *Thelma and Louise*, the two with tragic endings, are generally taken by viewers as serious feminist statements. The women not only fail; they are killed in their attempt to become free. There are father figures who offer help and protection. Rejection of that help puts them out in the cold as they come to be threats to the social institutions of a patriarchal society. In both cases, it is the kitchen which is used as a symbol of a woman's quality.

There are some interesting differences between the films. Theresa's desire for freedom is serious and intense; Thelma and Louise's is more casual. This may suggest that in the last twenty years it has become easier for women to liberate themselves physically. Secondly, in *Looking for Mr. Goodbar*, Theresa is only a victim of a crime, but in *Thelma and Louise*, the women become criminals themselves. Women, now equipped with a gun/phallus, are able to

attack and take revenge. No longer merely the recipient of male violence, where the phallus is a weapon of assault, they are now equals in their capacity for defense. Louise shoots the attempted rapist and later she and Thelma shoot up an abusive truck driver's truck in retaliation for violence. The women have become perpetrators now of violence.

From a feminist point of view, these changes in the depiction of women are not necessarily improvements. Women, still stereotypically associated with the kitchen, have to die to achieve their ends. Is that the message? There are only two choices? Death or the kitchen?

Women tend to be depicted in Japanese films with far greater power and strength of character. One thinks of Oshin and of women in *Trasan* films. Even yakuza films have featured women in main character roles (cf. the *Hibotan Oryuu* series popular among men in the late 1960s and early 1970s and *Gokudoo no Tumatachi* in the late 1980s and early 1990s.) Indeed, Japanese women characters may actually outnumber female characters in Hollywood films. This is not to imply equality in Japanese films but it is suggestive of the way films may be a key to the analysis of cultural values and the ways gender issues are culture specific.

Language learning is inseparable from culture learning. In this paper, I have tried to show how Japanese students may fail to capture the premise of American films. In order to get below a superficial interpretation of the content of outculture films, proper cultural guidance is necessary. In order to understand Western films, information on various aspects of Western culture, for example, some knowledge of the Judeo-Christian tradition, Greek mythology or Freudian psychoanalytic theory, is desirable. When using outculture films in class, teachers should not assume that students are equipped with cultural information required to appreciate the film. Themes conveyed in Hollywood films are diverse, complex, and often deeply embedded in cultural discourse. Equally important is an understanding of one's own culture if we are to recognize the filters in place when we attempt to analyze cultural artifacts. Teachers should always be aware of this potential cultural gap between films and the students. Otherwise, as my scenario for misunderstanding suggests, students may not achieve the depth of understanding that the instructor intends.

References

Condon, Jane. (1985). *A Half Step Behind. Japanese Women Today*. Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Company.

Iwao, Sumiko. (1993). *The Japanese Women.. Traditional Image & Changing Reality*. New York: The Free Press.

Kaplan, E. Ann. (1983). *Women & Film: Both Sides of The Camera*. London: Routledge.

AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE ON FILMS IN THE LANGUAGE CLASS

Thomas Hardy

About four years ago I became dissatisfied with the use of films in my content-based English classes in comparative cultures. Students were simply comparing societies, saying, for example, "The United States is individualistic, Japan is cooperative." What students were missing, and what some asked for, was a sense of where these differences came from and how they affected people's lives--in films and in real life. For example, Naomi Y. noted in her comments on an end-of-class evaluation that she had learned a lot about the USA. For her this was a first step in being "international." But she wanted more. "An international person needs to know more than information about America. Or about Japan. We need to learn to think abut other cultures and our own in an objective way ."

This and similar comments started me thinking about using films in comparative culture classes to emphasize critical thinking skills. Some have suggested that these skills are particularly important, and difficult, for Japanese students, given the rigor of their rote and prescriptive education (McCornick, 1992). Without endorsing this view, or suggesting that miracles can be worked, I have found that films can start students thinking analytically and critically of the cultures of others, of their own culture, and their place in it.

This reflects my background in anthropology, which I see as a comparative and critical discipline. Comparative in that anthropologists look both at particular cultures and the diversity within and among them, and at constants within and between them. Critical in that, for many anthropologists, the knowledge they wring from their particular and comparative studies leads them back to their own culture. The process goes something like this: The particular studies let us appreciate the fit or lack of fit of experience to its particular social structure and historical context. Comparing these studies allows us to see the range of human experience and the diversity of responses to similar situations. This, hopefully, awakens in the observer a sense of the constraint she or he lives under and a sense of the alternatives possible. I use films to help my students through something like this anthropological process.

In no way is this a new approach to comparative social research. Montaigne, writing in 1590 in Renaissance France, practiced it in his essay "Of Cannibals" (1991). The particular knowledge gained in the early voyages of European exploration, the knowledge of the Other, allows Montaigne to compare it with life in Europe at the time and to make

critical sense of his own life and culture. To the students in my classes these analytic and critical skills are new. Using films, a medium they enjoy and seem to think of as a pleasure, starts them thinking along these lines while making the job of learning content and analytical skills in the medium of English seem less like work. A discussion of one such class might help make what I mean more clear.

Americans: Values and Society

I start the class by asking students to describe their "typical" American, the person they see as hero or heroine in most films they watch. Given time they usually come up with a short list that comes close to describing the dominant or referent group of the United States: male, white, English-speaking, Protestant, professional or managerial, suburban, and college-educated, among other characteristics. I tell the students that I have reservations about using and reinforcing this view of America and Americans. Nevertheless, I let it stand. First, because justly or unjustly this referent group does indeed exercise power in the United States. Second, this group does, in most ways and under most circumstances, set the standards against which other, less powerful groups (women, African Americans, and gays, to name just three) resist or acquiesce. Third, for the purposes of comparison, either within the United States or between the United States and another culture, some base is necessary.

I then ask students to work in teams and, thinking about their experience with Americans or popular American movies and television, come up with a list of values, beliefs, or standards of conduct of the dominant American group. With a little work and artful manipulation of answers I can usually get a list of values that roughly replicates that of Alexis de Tocqueville (1945) on his visit to the Untied States in the 1830's, namely: individual freedom and self-reliance, equality of opportunity and competition, and material wealth and hard work.

As we work out the meaning of these terms in the American context, I remind students that these are the ideal values, the *tatemae*, not the reality or *honne* of American life. The films they normally see--comedies or tragedies, romances or action films--represent these ideals, affirming, rejecting, or simply provoking a reaction to them in one way or another. I remind them again that these are the values of a specific group: the dominant group. Those in power can use these values to suppress and limit the lives of others who are outside of the group--through birth or training or skills or inclination. These are values that would be different, very different, if we were considering films by and about, for example, inner-city women or the rural poor or migrant workers.

Once the students seem to have a basic idea of what these values are about, I ask them

where Americans experience them, what are the institutions of society. We usually wind up with a list that includes the family, economic and business institutions, government, education, and religion. We also usually include institutions specific to American society because of particular historical experiences. In the case of the United States, one is ethnicity and race, from the experience of assimilation and diversity and slavery in American society. Another, differing wildly in depth, is sports and recreation, from the ways organized sports, as distinct form individual play, illustrates and reinforces American values.

I assign specific social institutions to teams of students. They use worksheets to describe the institutions in the lives of Americans and, analyze the ways the values of the dominant social group are reflected in it. We exchange these reports.

Films and American Values: *Bull Durham*

With this background of team reports and discussions, we vote on an institution of general interest and I select an appropriate film to watch. If, for example, students select sports, we watch *Bull Durham*, a film about a minor league baseball team set in Durham, North Carolina. We spend a couple of classes watching parts of the film and analyzing it in terms of the American values laid out earlier. With frequent use of the pause button, students get used to the ways values are reflected in films. They learn, first, that popular culture is packed with all sorts of information about the society that created it. It is their jobs, as careful viewers, to unpack it and select what is important from what isn't, to recognize the biases and prejudices of the work and build analyses around them, to identify examples and counter-examples of the values, and to recognize the way these biases are played on in the film.

Here is the way I have approached one short three-minute scene form the film. Ebby (Tim Robbins) is an undisciplined but talented pitcher, put out in the farm leagues to develop. The "organization" has brought in Crash (Kevin Costner) to groom Ebby in the ways of baseball. After a series of entanglements--professional, moral, and romantic--Ebby gets transferred to a major league team and rushes to a local pool hall to tell Crash the news. Crash is less than thrilled and picks a fight.

> Crash: What do you mean you're not goin' to fight me.
> [Crash shoves Ebby in the chest with his hands as he talks.]
> Crash: You fuck.
> Ebby: Fuck? Why am I a fuck?
> Crash: Why are you a fuck?
> Ebby: [Overlapping] Why am I a fuck?
> Crash: Cause you got, 'cause you got talent. I got brains but you got talent.
> [Crash raises Ebby's arm.]

> Crash: See this right arm? Worth a million bucks a year. All my limbs put together aren't worth seven cents a pound. (Shelton 1992, pp. 91-92)

I first get the profanity out of the way--in part by linking it to the values of the male subculture of sports and the processes of male-male bonding. From there I go on to focus students' attention on the values inherent in Crash's anger. He is hardworking. He puts in the time. He has the loyalty and the smarts. He reveres the fair play and competition that are part of the creed of the Church of the Diamond. Yet the rewards for his hard work, most specifically material wealth, escape him. Ebby, on the other hand, by virtue simply of his talent will succeed in ways that Crash will never. Talented Ebby will become rich, hardworking Crash will remain poor. The failure of the American values of hard work and material success to reciprocate the way they should fuels the anger of the film in this scene and makes Crash a sympathetic character.

Together we unpack the values and assumptions of two or three more scenes in the movie. Then students go to the movies. I hand out a short list of suggested films for each social institution. Each team selects one film, watches it off campus, analyzes it, responds to it in some way, and shares their work with the class.

By the end of this exercise, students seem to have a fair grasp of the basic skills of analysis and the ways films and society reflect one another. The fact that the culture being analyzed is some exotic Other society (Durham, North Carolina, in the example) seems to help students see the workings of social values, since it can be difficult for them as insiders to see these values in their own culture. Additionally, I try to avoid stereotypes by constantly reminding students that most of the films represent the values of America's dominant group, even when the film critiques the group and its values. This brings us about half way through the semester.

Films about Japanese Values and Institutions

In the second half of the semester I have students take their skills at analyzing the values and practices of other cultures and turn them on Japan. The values become a lens to see their own society more clearly. We spend one class coming up with a profile of the dominant group in Japanese society and another class making a list of some of the values of that group. This usually includes such values as group orientation, hard work (*gambaru*), hierarchy, dependency, cooperation, and harmony. Next we develop a list of significant institutions, usually but not always replicating the list from the United States. Changes might include replacing race with community. Students then get back into their teams and do some research on the nature of their team's institution in Japan. They use

worksheets to describe their institution in the lives of Japanese and, analyze the ways the values of the dominant social group are reflected in it. We exchange these reports.

By this point, it is time to start watching Japanese movies. Earlier in the term we watched sections of an American film together in class (the *Bull Durham* example). Each team has watched a film about a specific American institution and has reported in detail to the class on the expression of their institution in a film. For films about Japan, I rely heavily on students' judgment. I suggest films, for example *Tokyo Monogatari* for the team working on the family or Kurosawa's *Ikiru* as a classic film about government. Ultimately, I let the students pick and choose. As they did for the United States, each team selects a Japanese film about an assigned institution, watches the film off campus, and then analyzes, and responds to it. Later, each team shares its work with the class.

Student Responses

I have collected student comments about the class on course evaluations for the last three years. The responses have been generally positive. Most find it an insight that films can be more than entertainment. They are surprised to find films laden with the values of their makers. The comment by Hiroko O. is typical of this response. "It's good for me to watch some movies. I only watch movies till this class just started. But now I see movies with thinking about their background values. It will get interesting to watch movies and TV in my future."

Other students go beyond this and make their first critical insights into their own culture and values using the comparative and analytic skills of the class. Yoshiko A. wrote, "I realized that to be International people we should know not only other country but also to know our own culture well." Another student, Yasue K. took this a step further when she noted, "I had have opportunity to think about Japanese values. When we leave in Japan, we sometimes don't think what the Japanese based on history or our origin. I fount that our life has a important meaning with values to understand what the Japanese is." Or there are the comments of Tomomi O. who noted that the class brought films and thinking about Japan together for her when she wrote, "I have had the chance to look at Japan and movies from an objective view, so that I fund lots of new facts of the Japanese society which I did not recognize before."

Some students go beyond the a recognition of the values inherent in popular culture and beyond simple comparative statements. They begin to make a fuller critical and reflective response to their own society and their place in it. Take for example the comments of Nobuaki I. "Dominants have their own values and use it to control other people. I watch movies and think to touch on this." Misato S. had a similar response

when she wrote, "I learned ways to analyze the values of the dominant group in a each culture. The values itself (like Japanese dependence) were thought-provoking." Another student, Yuko S, took this critical response a step further. She commented on the ways the values of the dominant group shape the values and responses of less powerful groups when she wrote, "I think to learn dominant groups is to know not dominant groups. For example, if I learn about the white, I can know the discrimination of the Negro and if I learn about the men-dominant society, I can know that women are often not still accepted in the society. At this point, the film work is very useful for me."

A few students begin seriously considering their own culture and their places in it critically. They start to question what before had been simple truths to them. By extension, this questioning might awaken them to a sense of the diversity surrounding them. Consider the comments of Toshio K., "As for me, the Japanese way of thinking is that the one who always receive many information will never analyze and criticize them. The worse is, he believe these information are his original ideas even though they may be some propaganda of some institutions. This class and films is good for always emphasize the important of criticizing and analyzing movie and society. You try us to realize there are many ways of thinking in the world (and even in Japan)."

Student responses suggest that the course is doing what I want it to. In the first place, all the work in the class is conducted in English. Even more importantly, many students comment that the course develops their "objective" ability to compare cultures and that they become aware of films as more than simple entertainments. Others note that the course has helped them consider for the first time the ways the dominant group of any society, including their society, uses cultural values to reinforce its position in the society.

Conclusion

It is a long way from the critical and reflective musings of Montaigne to the responses of Japanese college students. But read sympathetically, the students share certain features with the French essayist. First, both exercise the basic anthropological skills of comparative thinking. They take the particulars of a society and use them to develop a sense of social diversity and constants. Second, both the students and Montaigne exercise the anthropological skill of critical thinking. They use what they have learned about particular cultures to reflect on their own culture and their places in it.

There are still things I want to do with the class. I want to find a way to start students thinking more concretely about the ways the dominant culture and its values work to suppress diversity. I want to reshape the class to help students become more aware of the alternatives less powerful groups have constructed, of other perceptions and experiences

and values. This might require shifting the course to focus on those groups rather than on the dominant group. It might require a class in liberation movements rather than relatively straightforward comparative cultures. It might require getting students out of the classroom and into the street, participating, observing, and interviewing. But this is getting away from a basic class in comparative culture and the use of films.

As it stands, the class is a good start in the basic anthropological skills of comparative and critical thinking. Students tell me that the structure of the early part of the class, by referring to another society, frees them to watch, analyze, and respond to films in ways they might not have done had they started with the too familiar, with Japan. They tell me that films, more than books, make the characters' experiences of the institutions, and the values there embedded, alive and immediate. Using the films allows them to bring together a personal response with critical cognitive analytic skills--skills the students can use in other classes, other situations, and, best of all, outside of class.

References

McCornick, A. (1993). Journal writing and the damaged language learner. In C.P. Casanave (Ed.), *Journal writing: Pedagogical perspectives* (pp. 6-17). Keio University, SFC, Institution of Languages and Communication.

Montaigne, M. de (1991). *The essays*. London: Allen Lane.

Tocqueville, Alexis de (1945). *Democracy in America*. New York: Vintage.

Shelton, R. (1992). *Bull Durham*. Tokyo: Four In Creative.

COPYRIGHT LAW AND VIDEO IN THE CLASSROOM

J. David Simons[1]

Like many things in life, your attitude towards copyright law may depend on your vested interest in the subject. If you are an educator who is teaching or researching then copyright law regarding copying books, articles, videos etc. may be quite restrictive. In this respect, you may believe in the view that all knowledge, art and culture once created should be free and accessible to everyone. Alternatively, if you are an educator who is publishing then copyright law becomes your friend and possibly the reason for your income. In this respect, you may take the view that the interests of those who create a work should be protected thus encouraging the authors of such work to produce more for the benefit of the public.....or for benefit to themselves.

The type of material which can be copyrighted can vary extensively--from the rights to a book, a soundtrack, a computer program, a public image or even to situations which you might consider to be quite extreme. Take for example the case of Carson v Here's Johnny Portable Toilets Inc. (1983) where a court upheld that the entertainer Johnny Carson had exclusive rights to the phrase "Here's Johnny" and was thus able to prohibit a toilet company from using his magic words to market their portable toilet.

Whatever your attitude towards copyright law, the fact is that it does exist, and I would like to provide here some guidelines as to how it relates to the recording and performance of video material for educational use. I will explain the general laws and guidelines in two countries: Japan and the United States and in two categories 1) off-air recording from broadcasts, satellite, or cable--in other words, recording from the TV and 2) the use of pre-recorded video tapes in the classroom. I would like to point out that these are guidelines only to provide some context in which to consider your use of video material. It is not specific legal advice. If you have a particular copyright problem, then it would be advisable to approach the copyright owners directly or to consult the guidelines (if they exist) of your local educational authority.

International Copyright

When we look at the copyright laws of different countries, the important point to remember is that even though there are international copyright conventions and treaties to which most major countries are signatories, technically there is no such thing as

[1]I would liketo express my thanks to my assistant, Mica Yano, for her invaluable help in the research of Japanese copyright law.

international copyright. Each country has its own copyright laws and adopts the provisions of international treaties as it sees fit. However, one of the major outcomes under these treaties and conventions is that each country protects the works produced in another country as if they had been produced within its own borders (Berne Convention, 1971). In other words, Japan will protect a video produced in the United States to the full extent of Japanese copyright law while the United States will protect a video produced in Japan to the full extent of U.S. copyright law. In a situation where the laws of the United States are stricter than the laws of Japan, this may lead to the anomaly of Japanese film makers enjoying more protection of their work in the United States than in their own country.

As with individuals, a country's attitude towards copyright law will depend on its vested interests. A country like the United States which has a huge film industry will be concerned with protecting strenuously the rights of ownership to its products while, on the other hand, Japan which has a huge manufacturing industry especially in the field of video cassette recorders, would perhaps logically want to encourage less copyright control and more pro-user sentiment. An example of this conflict of vested interests can be seen when Sony introduced the world to the video cassette recorder with its own record function. In 1979, in the United States, Sony was sued by Universal City Studios Inc. on the grounds that this record function was encouraging the illegal copying of copyrighted material. In a landmark decision, the U.S. Courts finally upheld the right of Sony to sell Betamax VCRs to home users for the purpose of "time-shifting," i.e., recording a TV program for private use at a more convenient time, thus paving the way for a home video recording boom (Universal City Studios v. Sony Corporation of America, 1981).

Japan

Off-air Recording

In Japan, the main provision governing copying copyrighted material for educational purposes is contained in Article 35 of the Japanese Copyright Law (1970) which states as follows:

> A person who is in charge of teaching in a school or other education institution (excluding those established for profit making purpose) may reproduce a work made public to the extent deemed necessary for the purpose of using it in the course of teaching. Provided that, this shall not apply if it prejudices unreasonably the interests of the copyright owner in the light of the nature and use of the said work as well as number of copies and mode of reproduction.

What does this mean as far as recording programs from television is concerned? Let us look at this question step by step.

First, the person instigating the recording must be the teacher. In other words, if a friend of yours records a TV program and then comes to you and says "You might want to use this video in class" then technically this would be illegal as the recording was not made by the teacher in charge of the class.

Second, the education institution for which the recording is done must be non-profit. This will include a private university but will not include a language school or cram school. Therefore, any copying done for a private language school of television programs will be illegal under the Act.

Third, there is the proviso that such copying shall not unreasonably prejudice the interests of the copyright owner. Now, in Japan, it is very difficult to discover what "unreasonably prejudice" means because virtually no cases have gone to court on this subject so there is no legal definition of the phrase.

In the absence of case law, I was referred often in my research to the work of Moriyuki Kato (1994)[2] and it seems that in the practical application of Japanese copyright law, his opinion is very well respected. In order to examine "unreasonable prejudice" in educational use he considers four points:

1. the kind of material used, e.g., copying a whole novel or fairy tale for a Japanese class is not allowed. Copying part of a literary work that has a limited availability is not allowed.

2. the purpose of copyright material, e.g., copying a student workbook or audiovisual teaching material for a class would not be allowed.

3. the number of copies--obviously the quantity copied will have a direct bearing on whether the educational use conflicts with the commercial rights of the owner

4. the form of reproduction, e.g., making copies in a form that is marketable would be illegal.

Using these four criteria as a guide to the interpretation of what prejudices unreasonably the right of the copyright owner, when the educational use clashes with commercial interests and overwhelms the profit or potential profit of the material, then the use of that material will be prohibited. With regard to videos, it seems that since the economic value of the material is very high, then the standards applied to dubbing will be very strict (Kato, 1994).

---

[2]The references to Kato have been translated from the Japanese by my assistant, Mica Yano, and paraphrased by me.

How does this translate into practice with regard to copying off-air? As long as the recording of programs from Japanese television complies with the conditions of Article 35 then it cannot be regarded as an infringement of the Copyright Law. That is to say, if you are an instructor at a non-profit educational establishment, you are able to record or authorise the recording of any TV program for use in your classroom provided such use does not unreasonably prejudice the right of the copyright owner. However, according to Kato (1994), once the recorded material has been used, thereafter keeping the reproduced works in school or in a video library would probably infringe the law and therefore it is desirable to discard a videotape after use.

Since the advent of satellite television is only a recent occurrence in Japan, no distinction is made between programs transmitted from terrestrial TV channels and those transmitted by satellite. However, my research assistant did have an interesting conversation with a representative of the satellite television company WOWOW. Originally, when asked if copying their broadcasts for educational purposes was permissible, they said that it was, subject to the guidelines Kato mentions with regard to kind of material, purpose, etc.. However, the next day they called back to say that they now considered recording of their programs even for educational purposes to be prejudicial to their commercial interests. If WOWOW chooses to take such a stance, there is no Japanese case law with which to challenge their policy. However, the converse will also be true in that if an instructor records a satellite broadcast for educational purposes and that instructor feels he or she is not unreasonably prejudicing the right of the copyright owner, the satellite company has no case law with which to challenge the instructor either. Until a case involving this phrase "prejudices unreasonably" is interpreted by the Japanese courts, then both copyright owner and instructor will continue to be in this copyright no-man's land.

In practice, it is understandable why a television company is reluctant to announce publicly that programs can be recorded for educational use under Article 35. For example, movies, sports programs and news programs are normally purchased under contracts which will restrict the recording of these programs by third parties or which will protect the rights of privacy or publicity of those persons appearing in, for example, a documentary. Any public comment by a television company authorising an Article 35 recording may result in a breach of those contracts.

Pre-recorded Video Tapes

The relevant section of the Japanese Copyright Law 1970 which deals with the showing of a video in the classroom is Article 38 which reads as follows:

> A work already made public may be publicly presented, performed, recited or presented cinematographically for non-profit making purposes and without charging any fees to the audience or spectators.

The three criteria involved in Article 38 are 1) not being for profit-making purposes, 2) not collecting entrance fees, and 3) not paying the performers, which in the case of showing a video in the classroom is irrelevant here. With regard to the first criterion, non-profit making purposes, judgement should be made from the viewpoint of whether the use will indirectly lead to profit-making (Kato,1994). I am not sure how showing a movie at a language school would be interpreted, but I suspect that it would be seen as being for indirect profit-making purposes, even though students are not being directly charged for seeing the movie.

Provided therefore that all three criteria of Article 38 are met, a teacher at a non-profit making establishment can show a video movie in the classroom. It should be noted here that there is no provision as to whether the performance should be for educational purposes or who the audience should be.

As far as dubbing from a pre-recorded video is concerned, the Japanese Video Copyright Warning or American FBI Warning at the beginning of a pre-recorded tape, whether rented or purchased, makes it quite clear that such an act is illegal. However, the problem of copying movies for educational purposes is not generally a priority of copyright infringement enforcement agencies. In Japan, there are two reasons for this, both of which are based on practicalities. The first is that it is very difficult and complicated to get a copyright licence and secondly, there are more serious problems for the video industry such as the showing of videos in hotels, saunas and sightseeing buses for profit. In other words, showing dubbed movies in an educational establishment does not present as much of a liability to the video industry as other illegal uses do. However, the knowledge that an action is illegal but will not be prosecuted presents an ethical dilemma which I will address later.

Finally, how does the law apply to the copying of small clips from movies, e.g., to illustrate a language point in the classroom such as the use of certain idioms or conversational techniques? Again there is nothing in Japanese law to help you here apart from the "prejudices unreasonably" phrase in Article 35. If you feel that copying say a five-minute scene from a movie for educational purposes does not unreasonably prejudice the right of the copyright owner, at the moment there is no case law in Japan to specifically challenge this use.

United States

The Doctrine of 'Fair Use'

In the United States, the most important principle to consider for our purposes is the doctrine of fair use which was embodied into statute by Section 107 of the Copyright Law (Copyright Law of the United States of 1976). Basically, the doctrine of fair use is an equitable rule of reason (now expressed in statute) allowing a person to use copyrighted material in a situation which is deemed to be fair. It is not unlike the Japanese "doesn't unreasonably prejudice" except that the principle is much more defined in Section 107 of the Act which is as follows:

> Notwithstanding the provisions of Sections 106 and 106A (*which defines the exclusive rights of the copyright owner*) the fair use of a copyrighted work, including such use by reproduction in copies or phonorecords or by any other means specified by that section, for purposes such as criticism, comment, news reporting, teaching (including multiple copies for classroom use), scholarship, or research, is not an infringement of copyright. In determining whether the use made of a work in any particular case is a fair use the factors to be considered shall include:
>
> 1) the purpose and character of the use, including whether such use is of a commercial nature or is for non-profit educational purposes;
> 2) the nature of the copyrighted work;
> 3) the amount and substantiality of the portion used in relation to the copyrighted work as a whole; and
> 4) the effect of the use upon the potential market for or value of the copyrighted work.
>
> The fact that a work is unpublished shall not itself bar a finding of fair use if such finding is made upon consideration of all the above factors.

This doctrine applies to all uses of copyrighted material and is especially useful regarding making photocopies. However, the criteria embodied in Section 107 offer guidance only and each case will raise its own situation which will have to be decided on its own facts.

How does the doctrine of fair use affect the use of video? As an example, we can apply the criteria of section 107 to the situation where an instructor wants to use video clips to illustrate a language or cultural point. In this specific case, an instructor wants to copy a one-minute scene from the movie *Rising Sun* starring Sean Connery to show students how introductions are made between Japanese and non-Japanese. Let us apply the criteria of fair use to this situation. First, is the purpose for non-profit educational purposes? Yes. Good, that will go a long way to helping us. Second, what is the nature of the copyrighted work? Is it a rare movie? It is a general release movie and video.

Good. Therefore the work is not particularly exclusive. Third, is the copied portion a substantial amount of the whole? No. It is a one-minute clip only, less than 1% of the whole. However, we have to be careful here because a small portion does not necessarily mean unsubstantial. For example, if I copy just the smile from the Mona Lisa it may be just a small portion but it represents the substance of the painting; or I copy the final scene from a movie with the last line "The butler did it!"--only four words but an essential part of the plot. In one case in the United Kingdom, the producers of the TV series *Starsky and Hutch* successfully sued a publishing company for using one frame of a fifty-minute film for use on a poster. The use of the one-frame was found to be "substantial" although it should be remembered here that the frame was used here for commercial not educational purposes (Spelling, Goldberg v. BPC Publishing, 1981).

The final criterion to apply is what is the effect of the use on the potential market? In this case, almost negligible as it is unlikely that the instructor would wish to buy this particular video for just a one-minute segment. Therefore, under Article 107, the instructor has justification for saying that copying this one-minute clip was fair use (although the courts may say differently).

However, there is one additional point I would like to make here to demonstrate how complex copyright law can be. In the United States, there exists what is known as a right of publicity where a person (usually a famous personality) has the right to grant the exclusive privilege of publishing his/her picture or in the case of Johnny Carson, his catch-phrase, or in the case of look-alike actors, their visual image (although this right does not apply if the celebrity's activities have a bona fide news value). Therefore, if Sean Connery felt in anyway exploited by the use of this clip (which is probably not the case here), he could have an action against the instructor.

Off-air Recording

The most important application of the fair use doctrine with regard to off-air recording has been incorporated into guidelines laid down by a Negotiating Committee appointed by the House of Representatives--a group comprising representatives of educational organizations, copyright proprietors, and creative guilds and unions in the United States such as the National Education Association and the Directors Guild of America (Copyright Office, 1992; Appendix). These guidelines have not been incorporated into statute but they do provide the educator with useful rules as to what is considered fair use in taping off-air.

According to the guidelines, as with Japan, off-air recordings may be made only at the request of and used by individual teachers of a non-profit educational institution. The

recorded program can be retained for 45 consecutive calendar days after date of recording after which time it must be erased. Unlike Japan, there is a specified retention period in the United States for the recorded material. Broadcast programs here are TV programs transmitted by TV stations for reception by the general public free of charge, therefore these guidelines would not apply to cable TV. The recording can only be used once within the first ten consecutive school days of the 45 day retention period and may be used again within that period only for the purpose of teacher evaluation. Provided an instructor follows these guidelines for recording programs off-air, then his or her conduct will be considered fair use of the material.

Pre-recorded Video Tapes

The relevant section in the US Copyright Act governing the performance of movies and videos in the classroom is Section 110(1) which states that the following is not infringement of copyright:

> .....performance or display of a work by instructors or pupils in the course of face-to-face teaching activities of a non-profit educational establishment, in a classroom or similar place devoted to instruction, unless in the case of a motion picture or other audiovisual work, the performance, or the display of visual images, is given by means of a copy that was not lawfully made under this title, and that the person responsible for the performance knew or had reason to believe was not lawfully made.

Therefore, a legally obtained video being shown by instructors or pupils in the course of face-to-face teaching activities, again of a non-profit educational institution, in a proper place of instruction is quite legal. I should point out here that the showing of the video must be in the course of teaching activities and therefore, it is technically illegal to show a video to your class, say at the end of semester, purely as entertainment. Furthermore, this section of the Act limits the non-profit making activities to educational institutions only whereas in Japan no such distinction is made.

****

To sum up the situation in both Japan and the United States, I would like to go over briefly some of the main points of taping and performance for educational purposes. With regard to recording programs from the television, in Japan such recording is permissible provided it is instigated by an instructor at a non-profit educational institution and does not unreasonably prejudice the right of the copyright owner. In the United States, off-air recording is similarly permissible if made at the request of and used by

individual teachers of a non-profit educational institution but is also subject to specific guidelines and retention periods as laid down by the Negotiating Committee. The existence of these guidelines helps educators in the United States to interpret the fair use doctrine thus avoiding the problems of the Japanese legislation where the interpretation of unreasonable prejudice is extremely vague.

With regard to showing a pre-recorded video in the classroom, the relevant law in Japan is more generous than in the United States because the legislation refers not only to educational establishments but to any situation where a video may be shown publicly. Therefore, the presentation of a pre-recorded video in Japan is permissible provided only that the presentation is for non-profit making purposes and no entrance fees are collected. In the United States, however, the showing of a pre-recorded video is restricted to educational purposes and therefore is only possible in the course of face-to-face teaching activities at a proper place of instruction in a non-profit making educational institution.

The Satellite Question

As I mentioned previously, there is no such thing as international copyright law--each country has its own set of copyright laws. This notion is being severely challenged at the moment by satellite broadcasts. Normally, copyright owners are able to control the transmission of their work because a transmitter is linked to a certain country. Therefore, when a company acquires the right to broadcast a piece of work, it usually acquires the right to broadcast over all its transmitters in a particular region or country. However, a satellite is a transmitter in space outside the territory of any nation and cannot be related to the law of any nation. The footprint of the satellite, i.e., the reception area, will not necessarily match country's boundaries and anyway each country will have its own laws. In Europe, the EEC is in the anomalous situation of trying to harmonise the laws of copyright within its own boundaries, which are not necessarily within the boundaries of the satellite. Then there is the question of when the broadcast can be controlled for copyright purposes. When it is transmitted to the satellite or when it is received from the satellite? Some countries will allow recording for educational purposes, others will not. People with powerful dishes will be able to receive broadcasts outside the nominal range of the broadcasts and can make illegal copies. Legal action against such use will be costly.

Solutions will always lag behind technology but my own feeling is that the copyright laws will generally move more in favour of the user rather than the authors mainly because the ability to control the use of copyright material is becoming increasingly difficult.

Conclusion

Being aware of the laws regarding performance of videos in the classroom means you cannot now claim ignorance of the law as an excuse--which is not a valid defence anyway. However, the enforcement of copyright laws, especially as regarding video performance or copying is concerned, is very difficult and time and effort by enforcement agencies are generally directed against video piracy on a larger scale than the use of videos in an educational establishment. In fact, I have only experienced one case involving the illegal performance of a movie and that was when I lived on a *kibbutz* (small community farm) in Israel. My neighboring *kibbutz* was fined by a film company for broadcasting a film to the whole *kibbutz* without permission because it was deemed to be a public not private performance even though the audience were all members of the community and did not pay any admission charge. (Note: such a performance would be legal in Japan because the performance would be for non-profit making purposes and no distinction is made between public and private performance and educational use).

Therefore, the dilemma for us as educators will tend to be ethical rather than practical. Certainly, when teachers become members of their local educational authority in the United States they subscribe to the Code of Ethics of the Education Profession (National Education Association, 1994-95) which states that "the educator accepts the responsibility to adhere to the highest ethical standards." Is making illegal copies of videos without paying for them adhering to the highest ethical standards? Do we believe that material which has an educational and informative use should be freely available? Would we take a flower from someone's garden to let our students see a rose? In order to overcome these dilemmas, I think it is important for each educational authority or establishment to take the responsibility of creating a set of guidelines regarding copyright policy to help their staff. Where these guidelines do not exist and you are unaware of the law (this is relevant to all copyrighted material not just videos), I think a good yardstick to apply is the fair use principle of the United States. If you apply these conditions to what you are doing, I think you will find you are taking a responsible attitude towards your use of copyrighted material. By measuring your behaviour against the fair use criteria, you will either be able to justify your use as being fair or you will know that it is probably advisable to seek permission for your actions from the copyright owners.

References

Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works (Paris Revision 1971), Article 5.

Carson v. Here's Johnny Portable Toilets Inc., 698 f.2d 831 (6th Cir 1983).

Copyright Law of the United States of America 1976 [title 17 of the United States Code, Public Law 94-553, 90 Stat.2541(revised to February 1, 1993)].

Copyright Office. (1992). *Reproduction of Copyrighted Works by Educators and Librarians*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Kato, M. (1994). *Chosakukenhou chikujyou kougi (Copyright case law studies)*. Tokyo: Chosakuken Jyouhou Center.

National Education Association. (1994-95). *NEA Handbook* (pp. 387-388).

Spelling, Goldberg v. BPC Publishing 1981 RPC 280 [CA](NCET 6.4).

Universal City Studios Inc. v. Sony Corporation of America, 480 F. supp. 429, 203 U.S.P.Q. 656 (C.D. Cal. 1979) rev'd in part, 659 F. 2d 963, 211 U.S.P.Q. 761, 551 PTCJ D-1 (9th Cir. 1981).

Appendix

Guidelines for Videorecording of Broadcast Programming for Educational Purposes developed by the Negotiating Committee (U.S.)

1. The guidelines were developed to apply only to off-air recording by non-profit educational institutions.

2. A broadcast program may be recorded off-air simultaneously with broadcast transmission (including simultaneous cable re-transmissions) and retained by a non-profit educational institution for a period not to exceed the first forty-five (45) consecutive calendar days after date of recording. Upon conclusion of such retention period, all off-air recordings must be erased or destroyed immediately. "Broadcast programs" are television programs transmitted by television stations for reception by the general public without charge.

3. Off-air recordings may be used once by individual teachers in the course of relevant teaching activities, and repeated once only when instructional reinforcement is necessary, in classrooms and similar places devoted to instruction within a single building, cluster or campus, as well as in the homes of students receiving formalized home instruction, during the first ten (10) consecutive school days in the forty-five (45) day calendar day retention period. "School days" are school session days--not counting weekends, holidays, vacations, examination periods, or other scheduled interruptions--within the forty-five (45) calendar day retention period.

4. Off-air recordings may be made only at the request of and used by individual teachers, and may not be regularly recorded in anticipation of requests. No broadcast program may be recorded off-air more than once at the request of the same teacher, regardless of the number of times the program may be broadcast.

5. A limited number of copies may be reproduced from each off-air recording to meet the legitimate needs of teachers under these guidelines. Each such additional copy shall be subject to all provisions governing the original recording.

6. After the first ten (10) consecutive school days, off-air recordings may be used up to the end of the forty-five (45) calendar day retention period only for teachers' evaluation purposes, i.e., to determine whether or not to include the broadcast program in the teaching curriculum, and may not be used in the recording institution for student exhibition or any other non-evaluation purpose without authorization.

7. Off-air recordings need not be used in their entirety, but the recorded programs may not be altered from their original content. Off-air recording may not be physically or electronically combined or merged to constitute teaching anthologies or compilations.

8. All copies of off-air recordings must include the copyright notice on the broadcast program as recorded.

9. Educational institutions are expected to establish appropriate control procedures to maintain the integrity of these guidelines.

AUTHOR BIOSTATEMENTS

Jeffrey Cady teaches at Athenee Francais in Tokyo and at Keio University SFC. His B.A. in philosophy is from Brown University (1974) and his M.Ed. in TEFL from Temple University, Japan (1988). He is co-author with Roger Barnard of Business Venture, Vols, 1 and 2 (Oxford). He has presented on video, teaching business English, and professional development for language teachers at teachers' conferences in Japan.

Christine Pearson Casanave received a PhD from the Stanford University's School of Education in 1990. She is now Associate Professor of English at Keio University SFC and an adjunct instructor at Teachers College Columbia University's Tokyo campus. Her interests include second language reading and writing, disciplinary socialization, and the professional development of language educators.

David Freedman teaches English at Keio University SFC, and is deeply interested in the nonlinguistic issues raised by the use of film in the language classroom.

Naomi K. Fujishima received an MA TESOL degree from the Monterey Institute of International Studies, and is currently teaching English conversation at Yasuda Women's University in Hiroshima, Japan. Her teaching interests include global environmental issues and authentic video in the EFL classroom.

Thomas Hardy received a PhD in anthropology from the New School of Social Research in the literature department at Tamagawa University, and has a special interest in critical and comparative perspectives.

David P. Shea received his PhD in Language Education from the University of Georgia in 1993. Since then, he has tried to to integrate pedagogic theory with classroom practice while teaching in the intensive English program at Keio SFC. His areas of research interest include intercultural communication, the sociopolitical dimensions of langauge learning, and Vygotskian approaches to learning.

Yoko Shimizu is a senior in the Faculty of Policy Management at Keio SFC. She lived abroad for many years and hopes that some day she will be able to finish the autobiography she began after she returned to Japan.. During her spare time, she enjoys karaoke and writing nonfiction stories.

J. David Simons is a visiting lecturer at Keio University. He received his law degree from Glasgow University in 1973, and practiced law in Scotland for several years before moving into the field of language education.

Yoshiko Takahashi received her PhD from Stanford University's School of Education and is now at Keio University SFC. She teaches English and seminar courses in gender, communication, and feminist issues in films. She is interested in sociolinguistics and cross-cultural women's issues.

Sae Yamada, a third year student at Keio University SFC, grew up in Malaysia. She is majoring in Environmental Information. Her hobbies include aikido and reading.